

NURSE CORPS

Connelly, Susanne T. Picchi, Christine A.
 Cothern, Jimmie G. Ruschmeier, Elizabeth
 Fiddler, Iris E. M.
 Graham, Alfred E., Jr. Santos, Debra A.
 Haley, Kathleen A. Schemmer, Carol L.
 Hamachek, Susan M. Siegel, Robert M.
 Jones, Donald G. Smith, Margaret L.
 Leifeld, Deanna R. Spangler, Catherine E.
 Lloyd, Thomas M. Wright, Mitchell P.

Lt. Comdr. Allan C. Byrne, Jr., for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Supply Corps of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. Cmdr. Allen H. Wirzburger, for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line of the U.S. Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the staff corps of the Navy, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barber, Norman J. Dittman, David
 Bartlett, James Dunkleman, Dennis
 Bauer, Peter J. Ewing, Ronald C.
 Bennett, Ronald Fry, Wendell J.
 Boyles, Robert W. Gibson, Kenneth
 Broadhurst, Rona Greenan, John E.
 Brown, George R. Hastings, Jerry
 Buffington, John Hetrick, John R.
 Carroll, Robert Hickey, Rodney D.
 Crabtree, Roger Hisoire, Dennis
 Dawson, Richard Hixson, Steven R.
 Deibaugh, Thoma Holman, Larry D.
 Delong, Douglas Hovis, Robert S.
 Denayer, John W. Hughes, Francis
 Dial, William S. Huju, John I.

Johnson, David E.
 Joseph, William
 Kane, Robert J.
 Keenan, James M.
 Kneeb, Dale O.
 Kochis, James B.
 Kunkel, Clyde E.
 Kurtich, Richard
 Lemmerman, Donald
 Lewis, Morris N.
 Malinky, Robert
 Manley, Edward
 Maskulak, Michael
 McBride, Joseph
 McNair, John D.
 Mills, Wayne M.
 Moody, Johnny M.
 Morey, Arlen D.
 Moses, William R.
 Mullen, Michael
 Mullin, Jack A.
 Mullin, Jimmie J.
 Oldham, Richard
 Penn, Jerry D.
 Peterson, Jack L.
 Raymond, James L.
 Roman, Michael J.

Ruffin, Tommy L.
 Schick, Gary E.
 Schweinfurth, Ka
 Seelbach, Richard
 Shannon, Kenneth
 Shepherd, Jack W.
 Sheridan, Peter
 Silvas, Jose M.
 Skog, Roy R.
 Smith, Steven L.
 Stewart, George
 Stratman, Robert
 Thompson, J. Rona
 Tingley, Terry J.
 Todd, David J.
 Todd, Michael L.
 Tomlinson, Tommy
 Upton, Billy G.
 Waggoner, Lemuel
 Wallace, William
 Wanamaker, John
 Watts, Len S.
 Weappa, Larry R.
 West, Joseph J.
 Willis, George R.
 Yost, Harry E.

(junior grade) and temporary grade of lieutenant.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

Bang, Paul G. McKenzie, Donald R.,
 Burton, Robert N., Jr. Jr.
 Gregory, Troy R. Pitkin, Richard C.
 Holland, Benjamin A. Wimett, William T.
 McCoy, Rex C.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps in the permanent grade of ensign:

Assad, Shay D. Holland, Benjamin A.
 Atkinson, Eric J. Mokodean, Mark M.
 Bang, Paul G. O'Connell, Matthew P.
 Cavanaugh, John H. Schrader, Thomas D.
 Feltes, Dale J. Wimett, William T.
 Gregory, Troy R.

Lt. (junior grade) John B. Montgomery, U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 26, 1973:

IN THE ARMY

Col. Leonard F. Stegman, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade of brigadier general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447, which was sent to the Senate on October 10, 1973.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FRANK E. SULLIVAN RECEIVES JOHN NEWTON RUSSELL MEMORIAL AWARD OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn that an outstanding citizen and valued friend, Mr. Frank E. Sullivan, vice president of the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., was recently honored by the National Association of Life Underwriters.

Mr. Sullivan received the John Newton Russell Memorial Award at the association's annual convention in Chicago. The award is the highest individual honor accorded by the life insurance industry, and is for "dedicated service above and beyond the call of duty."

Mr. Sullivan, until recently a resident of South Bend, Ind., in the district I represent, is not only an extremely successful insurance executive but has also made a lifetime career of civic service. I take great pleasure in his being recognized in this way by his industry, and include at this point in the RECORD the tribute to Mr. Sullivan which was delivered at the award dinner held a few weeks ago:

TRIBUTE TO FRANK E. SULLIVAN, CLU, RECIPIENT OF THE 1973 JOHN NEWTON RUSSELL MEMORIAL AWARD

If there is one truism that has validity and meaning in our lives, it is the reality that time is fleeting; that each moment given us to love, learn, serve, and share is truly precious and irreplaceable.

Even this perception of life does not deter most of us from being wasteful of time. However, there are those few in each generation who give it much higher priority . . . who are responsive to Marcel Proust's admonition: "The time which we have at our disposal is elastic; the passion that we feel expands it; those that we inspire control it; and habit fills up what remains."

You, Frank E. Sullivan, CLU, have used your God-given time in such fashion . . . in a manner that has not only brought you bountiful satisfactions and rewards; but, more importantly, has motivated the well-being of a socially-significant calling, enhanced the quality of life for your fellow citizens, and energized a commitment to excellence and service by thousands of your fellow life underwriters.

Frank E. Sullivan, CLU, you recently undertook great challenges as a senior officer of a large and esteemed life insurance company. You came to this position of trust and influence with impressive credentials as a life and qualifying member of the Million Dollar Round Table and a successful general agent, life insurance organizational leader, author, speaker, good citizen. Even more, you are acknowledged and lauded by your peers as a man of ever-stretching mind, of concern and empathy, of generosity of spirit and worldly goods.

Throughout an illustrious life insurance

career beginning in 1953, you have held firm a conviction that the life underwriter's primary mission is to help protect the security of the family. Thus, you have followed assiduously and imparted to others the philosophy: "Life insurance still has to be sold."

Your fulfillment of this personal obligation was graphically achieved with skill, hard work and dedication—and, particularly, through the creative and innovative use of time. In your professional endeavors and in writings, speeches, and encouragements, you have demonstrated it is possible to systematize use of time in life insurance salesmanship so that routine is minimized and creative service to others maximized.

Frank E. Sullivan, CLU, you are a native of Massachusetts and a loyal alumnus of the University of Notre Dame. After United States Naval service, you joined the American United Life Insurance Company to attain company leadership as both a personal producer and general agent.

Because of your self-imposed discipline in managing and employing time well and for the benefit of others, you have made notable contributions to your business, your fellow life underwriters, your community . . . without reneging on devotion to your family, daily church attendance, and a regimen for physical and mental fitness.

You have been president of the South Bend, Ind., Association of Life Underwriters; president of the Million Dollar Round Table in 1967—the youngest man ever to hold this prestigious post; and chairman of the American Society of Chartered Life Underwriters Journal board . . . and you now are chairman of the Life Underwriter Training Council.

You have written three acclaimed books

and numerous articles on life insurance selling, travelled in excess of 500,000 miles in the United States, Canada and Europe to address more than 300,000 life underwriters and others engaged in financial planning; been guest faculty member at several universities; and appeared in a well-received sales film.

The finely tuned balance of your eventful life is further reflected in a host of community and extra-curricular activities... many of which brought you significant accolades. We commend you, sir, for service in the National Urban Coalition, United Community Services, Health Care Foundation, advisory council for the Notre Dame School of Business. We honor you as recipient of the Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; and the Golden Plate Award of the American Academy; as Notre Dame alumni man of the year; as one of your community's outstanding young men.

Frank E. Sullivan, CLU, in your position of life insurance leadership and influence, you have counseled your fellows to be men and women of conviction and dedication; to develop the art of clear and enthusiastic communication; to amass technical and worldly knowledge; and, perhaps above all, to use each moment of their time with creativity in good cause.

That you, personally, have followed this meaningful advice is a measure of your character and commitment... and the richness and relevance of your endeavors conclusively demonstrate its enduring worth.

Mindful of your moral conviction and exemplary attributes which have inspired so many others to emulate your example as of the country's incomparable life insurance salesman, it is with the greatest pleasure that the Award Committee cites you, Frank E. Sullivan, CLU, as recipient of the 1973 John Newton Russell Memorial Award.

FUEL CRISIS AND ECONOMY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Hobart Rowen's column, "Fuel Crisis and the Economy," which appeared in the Washington Post of November 18 brings both perspective and realism to the problems this country faces in the current energy crisis:

FUEL CRISIS AND THE ECONOMY (By Hobart Rowen)

Former Economic Council Chairman Walter W. Heller wisely observed in a special article for the Wall Street Journal last week that because of the oil crunch, all forecasts for inflation in 1974 are now "subject to change without notice." Let's go one step beyond that: all forecasts of any kind are useless.

The only realistic assumption that can be made is that the economy will be in some sort of recession next year and will continue to be depressed while the Arab oil embargo lasts.

Just how bad the economic slide here will be depends on a number of unknown factors, including the duration of the embargo and the wisdom of U.S. leaders in handling the shortage problem.

So far, there is little reason to be optimistic on either score: the Arabs seem interested in limiting their production and maximizing profits (already huge) regardless of the outcome of the Egyptian-Israeli negotiations; and the Watergated Nixon administration

once again appears to be bungling an economic management job.

The clear need at the moment is to install a gasoline rationing program that would sharply cut pleasure driving, so that energy resources still available can be husbanded for essential industry.

But administration spokesmen are all over the lot on this issue, some trying to sweep the urgency of the problem under the rug. Others talk wistfully of a "free market" approach, letting prices skyrocket in order to create new production incentives as well as to diminish consumption.

The trouble with letting prices shoot up should be obvious. Not only would that mean the well-to-do could use and waste resources at will while people of modest means suffer, but such a "solution" would raise unholy hell with the economy.

Heller points out that fuel prices had been soaring even before the "shock-down." Thus, the price index of fuels, related products and power (representing 7 per cent of the wholesale price index) had risen 20 per cent from September, 1972, to September, 1973. Refined petroleum products rose 35 per cent in that period.

Further price increases are certain. But unless rationing and price controls are made effective, costs will go out of sight.

Some administration officials, notably Economic Council Chairman Herbert Stein and Treasury Secretary George Shultz—who fear any kind of controls—would opt for a surtax system to reduce consumption of gasoline.

But Treasury experts admit that each penny of additional tax sucks \$1 billion out of total purchasing power. If—as Gov. John Love suggested—the country needs a 30-cent tax to cut consumption of gasoline by 20 per cent or so, that would pull \$30 billion out of individuals' pockets and into the Treasury.

Even if a chunk of that were rebated in various ways, it would be likely to throw the economy into a serious recession.

In any event, the administration has badly failed the nation in assessing and coming to grips with the energy problem. The most compelling energy statistic I've seen comes from Deputy Treasury Secretary William E. Simon:

Prior to the Middle East crisis, the administration's expectation was that energy consumption in the United States would increase by 4 per cent a year, doubling 1970's needs by about 1980.

And how did we plan to get that increased energy supply? From the Middle East, because oil there was cheap. The idea of considering national security in economic terms apparently never occurred to the administration. Now, Mr. Nixon talks of "independence" by 1980.

Back in April, the President sent a message to Congress in which he referred to an energy "challenge"—he wouldn't even use the word "crisis". Five years too late, Mr. Nixon abandoned oil quotas. Yet, there was no recognition that oil was an international problem, and that some day we would have to come to grips with an international cartel with a stranglehold on key supplies.

Meanwhile, the domestic oil industry, fat and comfortable, wasn't anxious to add to refinery capacity or to prove out new reserves. Some oil industry leaders confess they badly underestimated how fast demand would rise, but most tend to blame the conservationists for holding back new exploration.

Early this year, former Commerce Secretary Peter G. Peterson came back from a trip around the world and reported to the President that energy would be the United States' overwhelming problem for the next decade, but he was politely ignored.

Peterson tried to get Henry Kissinger's at-

tention focussed on the problem, but Kissinger was too preoccupied.

In his report, Peterson sharply highlighted U.S. dependence on Middle East oil for the projected growth of the economy through the 1970s and early 1980s. In an interview with him published in the Washington Post on July 9, 1973, I reported:

"Peterson's figures assume that the Middle East countries will continue to be attracted by higher prices, increase their production and sell the West all the oil it wants to buy."

"But the Middle East countries, knowing that their oil resources are finite, may decide not to increase production so rapidly. And in any event, the Middle East countries broadly suggest that unless there is a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict more satisfactory to them, they may not cooperate with the West at all."

The administration wasn't listening.

Around mid-year, Mr. Nixon appointed Love to head an Energy Policy Office, but a sense of urgency didn't emerge until the shock of the oil embargo that accompanied the outbreak of war in the Middle East.

Mostly, the past few months have been a time of fumble and stumble. Mandatory allocation of propane and middle distillate fuels was put in, but gasoline and electricity consumption are still subject to only voluntary restraint.

Above all else, the administration needs to act at once to put a mandatory rationing system in effect for private transportation and home heating oils.

At the same time, it must address itself to developing new sources of energy for the long haul, and to working with other Western nations in the short run to find ways of persuading the Arabs to lift their embargo.

There is no reason why the Western nations should not consider economic counter-sanctions, from food shipments to sales of manufactured products (including aircraft and arms) to technical aid and knowhow. A retaliatory embargo, of course, would require the Western World to act together. Given the Arabs' success in forcing Britain and France to make the right anti-Israeli noises, and the possibility of similar successful blackmail against Japan, prospects for the success of such a concerted drive look dim indeed.

STATEMENT ON S. 1081—ALASKAN PIPELINE AUTHORIZATION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep concern regarding two very important issues now facing the Nation, the energy crisis and environmental protection.

Our Nation is facing a grave crisis because of decreasing energy resources. With the recent cutoff of some foreign supplies and increasing domestic demand for energy, it is obvious that we must find and tap available energy resources within the United States. We must have energy to remain a great nation; I do not think for a moment that we can suddenly cut our energy usage without creating a disastrous situation. The Alaskan oil reserves will supplement our energy input, and I feel we must begin using these reserves. However, the way we go about tapping the Alaskan oil fields is also very important.

One aspect of the greatness of this Nation is our quality of life. The natural beauty, grandeur and variety of our environment enhances our lives not only esthetically but in terms of our physical health. We must protect the environment from unnecessary and indiscriminate harm; environment protection is as important to the future well-being of this Nation as is maintaining adequate supplies of energy.

I believe that we can find a logical, fair, and extensively examined compromise between our energy needs and protection of the environment. We must carefully balance our demand for energy with the need for a healthy and safe environment in which to live. For this reason, I voted against S. 1081, the Alaskan Pipeline Authorization.

First, all possible alternatives were not adequately considered in the discussion of this legislation. The State Department failed to sufficiently investigate the adequacy and desirability of a trans-Canadian pipeline. A number of other alternatives should also have been considered in depth before the trans-Alaskan pipeline was authorized.

In addition, passage of this bill seriously jeopardizes present environmental protections. It was a difficult and lengthy battle to begin to incorporate environmental safeguards into our system of laws. Passage of the National Environmental Policy Act in 1970 took us a long way toward the goal of living in harmony with the environment. S. 1081, however, overrides the protective guarantees of NEPA and removes from the people the right of access to the courts for relief of injustices done by the construction of the pipeline. Not only is this a very dangerous procedure, it also sets a precedent for bypassing environmental protections in the future, rendering NEPA useless and ineffective and relegating environmental concerns to second place.

I also object to this legislation on other grounds. It favors west coast oil and shipping concern over those in the Midwest and Eastern sections of the country, the areas that will be hit hardest by shortages in the future.

Again, I want to say that my vote against S. 1081 does not reflect a lack of understanding and concern for U.S. energy needs. I believe that it is important that we tap the oil reserves in Alaska, but I feel that we must also show vital interest in the environmental problems this development will create. I feel that S. 1081 does not fairly balance necessary environmental safeguards and energy needs, and I, therefore did not support the bill.

STANLEY PENKALA

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, it is alarming to know that some 750,000 children and adults suffer from cerebral palsy in this country. It has been esti-

mated that cerebral palsy occurs in 1 out of 200 live births. At the present rate, approximately 15,000 infants are born each year with this condition.

Cerebral palsy is a condition which originates in the brain, usually at birth, and control of the muscles is affected. There are some preventive measures used for pregnant women, but our focus must be on management programs to help the afflicted child achieve maximum potential in growth and development. Despite the multitude of State and local organizations throughout this country who dedicate themselves to aiding those suffering from cerebral palsy, there is still not enough money or personnel to deal with the problem.

In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of Senators Mr. Stanley Penkala of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., whose untiring efforts on behalf of handicapped people have earned recognition locally and nationally. He received the Dr. Benjamin Rush Award of the Luzerne, Pa., County Medical Society and a special award by the National United Cerebral Palsy Associations. Mr. Penkala, who suffers from cerebral palsy, is well known by those who reside in Luzerne County as the chief of security at the Luzerne County courthouse. He is also active in community affairs. He was an original member of the United Cerebral Palsy Organization of Wyoming Valley.

I have known Stanley Penkala to be a dedicated, hard-working man. He was done much to bring comfort to children and adults in Luzerne County. Through his volunteer efforts, many are now able to lead a normal life. I commend him for his outstanding work, and his concern for his fellow man has made him an example for all of us who are privileged to know him.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO SALINITY AGREEMENT

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the October issue of *Aqueduct*, the magazine of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, contains the following notable article concerning the recent agreement between Mexico and the United States to control salinity levels of the Colorado River at the border:

THE MEXICAN WATER TREATY—A NEW INTERPRETATION

A new chapter is being written on the often strained relations between the United States and Mexico over water from the Colorado River.

On its way to Congress soon will be a so-called "permanent, definitive" solution to Mexico's complaints about the salt content of water delivered in the past 12 years. The dispute has resulted primarily from highly saline irrigation return flow water from the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation District near Yuma, Arizona.

The price tag on the solution: at least \$115 million in works to be built by the United States, including the world's largest desalting plant on the Wellton-Mohawk drain at a cost of \$67 million.

"It was a political settlement on the part of former U.S. Attorney General Herbert Brownell," said Ray Rummonds, chairman of the Colorado River Board of California. "He had to work amid conflicting interests of the United States and Mexico as well as those of the water-short seven Colorado River Basin States."

Brownell was appointed by President Nixon, with the rank of ambassador, to study the salinity problems and come up with a settlement.

Mexico, under a new interpretation of the 1944 treaty with the United States, will be provided water that is very comparable in quality to that being diverted for irrigation in Imperial Valley in Southern California. Specifically, it is to be only 115 parts per million higher in salt content than that at Imperial Dam. It's currently 850 ppm at Imperial Dam, the last major diversion point on this side of the border.

"Congress will now have to authorize the works and appropriate the necessary funds on a timely basis to carry out the settlement in good faith," Rummonds said.

"It is clearly a national obligation—one which should be borne at federal expense without adverse impact on water and power users of the seven states."

At a press conference at the Western White House in San Clemente, Brownell announced the signing by both countries of a new agreement specifying the quality of 1.5 million acre-feet annually that must be delivered under the treaty, which is administered by the International Water and Boundary Commission.

"It was part of the treaty after construction of Hoover Dam that Mexico would take water that included irrigation return flow," Rummonds said.

"But no one foresaw the development of the Wellton-Mohawk Project and the highly saline flow from drainage wells that would get into the river. In 1961, when Wellton-Mohawk drainage began entering the river, the water at Morelos Dam, where Mexico diverts to the Mexicali Valley, rose to well over 1500 parts per million salt."

The United States will line with concrete the first 50 miles of the Coachella Branch of the All-American Canal to conserve some 130,000 acre-feet of water that now leaks from the canal into the underground. That will allow temporary releases to Mexico of an equivalent amount of water from upstream storage.

For the past year, Mexico has been bypassing Wellton-Mohawk drainage water and the U.S. has replaced about 118,000 acre-feet, half the bypassed water, with supplies from storage or wells along the river.

Other aspects of the agreement, of principal concern to Arizona, will be limiting Mexico and the United States to 160,000 acre-feet each year which they can pump from an underground basin near the Arizona-Sonora boundary.

The United States will also support Mexico in obtaining loans from international sources to assist farmers of the Mexicali Valley and provide funds for the installation of tile drains. The Mexican government estimated to Brownell that 75,000 acres of land in the valley have gone out of production because of salty soil and salty water used for irrigation.

"You could fill volumes and volumes about the history of Mexico-U.S. relations on water from the river, going right back to the time of negotiations that resulted in the 1944 treaty," Rummonds said.

"For many years after construction of Hoover Dam there was a surplus of water flowing into Mexico."

"When the supplies became tighter and the United States limited the flow to the treaty terms, the Mexican farmers probably tried to stretch the supply over too much acreage. Without proper leaching, salt con-

tinued to build up in the naturally salty soil of the Mexicali Valley."

In announcing the signing of the new agreement, Ambassador Brownell said that the quality of water delivered could be improved permanently without adversely affecting any of the planned programs for development of the natural resources in the states.

That has not, as yet, alleviated the considerable concern of the Committee of Fourteen, a group with representatives appointed by the governors of each of the seven basin states. In the case of California, the two representatives are Myron Holburt, chief engineer of the Colorado River Board, and John R. Teerink, director of the State Department of Water Resources.

"Arizona officials have shown perhaps the greatest concern over Brownell's negotiations with the Mexican government because the Central Arizona Project has the lowest priority of water entitlement under the law of the river," Holburt said. "However, the other basin states could also be injured if the United States does not undertake the necessary measures to prevent adverse impacts on the states."

"If the necessary public works aren't built and operated effectively," he said, "Arizona wouldn't want to give up precious water for releases downstream to improve salinity at the border. Nor would the other states."

The committee has pointed out to Brownell and the Nixon administration and to Congressional representatives of the states that there are many questions that remain to be answered.

Where will the electric power come from to operate the desalting plant? And the 40,000 to 50,000 acre-feet of replacement water needed to carry brine from the desalting plant to the Gulf of California?

"It would be foolish, too, to concern ourselves only with salinity at the border while salt is building up slowly for nearly the entire river north of Imperial Dam," Holburt said.

Three bills now in Congress, signed by all 14 senators and 35 representatives of the Basin states, would authorize salinity control projects in the Upper Basin to remove 400,000 tons of salt annually from the river at a cost of some \$135 million. The bills also authorize feasibility reports on other projects to remove even more salt from the 1400-mile-long river.

The field trips to the Mexicali Valley by Brownell and his staff are over. The closed-door negotiations with Mexican officials have resulted in a highly significant new reading of the 1944 treaty. The "good faith" plans to be laid before Congress call for relining the Coachella Canal by 1976 and completion of the desalting plant and brine disposal facilities of Wellton-Mohawk by July, 1978.

The "permanent, definitive" solution is on paper as a national pledge to our neighbors south of the border, contingent on Congressional appropriations.

But it's a pledge that remains of great concern to the water users of the seven states.

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC POLICY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of a most per-

ceptive editorial concerning the relationship between social science and domestic programs in the United States.

The editorial, entitled "Faculty Engineers or Neglected Experts?" is by Amitai Etzioni, professor of sociology at Columbia University and director for the Center for Policy Research there.

The editorial appears in the July 6, 1973, issue of *Science*, a publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

I believe Professor Etzioni's essay correctly draws attention to some of the thoughtless criticisms made of the role of social sciences in a number of federally supported domestic programs. The article follows:

FAULTY ENGINEERS OR NEGLECTED EXPERTS?

Social scientists are being made scapegoats for the failure of dozens of domestic programs. The October 1972 issue of *Fortune* reports that "social engineers retreat under fire"—a main source of the shots fired being *Fortune* itself. Its staff writer Tom Alexander reports: "There's plenty of material for recrimination." He then recites the by now familiar catalog of failures of the domestic programs, failure to abolish welfare, poverty, school segregation, and so on—problems that have not been solved despite "record" investments.

The charges against social scientists are about as well founded as those brought in the early 1950's, equating social science with socialism. The discipline, as such, is no more at fault for the failure of many Great Society programs than the study of international relations is for the American involvement in Vietnam.

First, most programs did not receive the funds and manpower they needed. Alexander is, of course, technically correct: the investments in domestic programs reached "record" levels. But this does not make them high, and certainly not high enough.

Second, many solutions require tradition-bound citizens and legislatures to reexamine their views about the world, human nature, and human values. If they balk, and block progress, there is little a social scientist can—and maybe should—do. Thus, crime is usually ranked as the number one domestic problem. Recently the President, on the heels of the governor of New York, has sought to reinstate the death penalty because, it is alleged, all other efforts to turn back the rising wave of crime have failed. But the fundamental remedies that most social scientists favor have not even been tried. Many politicians prefer to grandstand against crime with "tough" speeches and suggest "tough" measures that they must know are either ineffectual or unconstitutional or both. Why point the finger at social scientists?

The social sciences could be more vigorous than they are—if the politicians would let them. The social sciences, as a group, have been the neglected branch of the sciences, receiving a mere 2 to 3 percent of the resource pie, and even that much only in recent years. No wonder there are fields in which little is known: how to help disadvantaged children catch up, for example, or how to respond to the growing dissolution of the family. But even in these areas social scientists can at least point to what will not work. The Coleman Report pointed out that the kind of efforts undertaken, at a cost of roughly \$1.2 billion a year, had no discernible results.

If America now seeks to attend to its long list of social problems, an increased investment in social science is the order of the day—not a chopping of their sources of support. Furthermore, social programs, in which

the findings of social scientists are utilized, must be allowed to go through the same research and development sequence that missiles and lunar landing crafts go through. An initial mistake made by social scientists was agreeing to the use of their theories in attempts to plan societal changes. They should have insisted on design or table-top or wind-tunnel models in order to initiate, not to bypass, the research and development sequence. We must stop trying to jump directly from sociological blueprints into multibillion-dollar programs.

We can no longer delay facing our domestic needs, and we cannot deal with them without the help of the social sciences. But the social sciences themselves will require much nourishment and fortification before they will be able to fully measure up to this mission.

FUEL SHORTAGE

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the continuing fuel shortage we are now facing, it is ridiculous to reduce the speed limit on our highways to 50 miles per hour, while the automobile manufacturers continue to turn out gasoline-guzzling, 300-horsepower engines. I propose that all new car engines be required to meet a minimum of 20 miles per gallon in their performance.

Years ago, there were automobile engines that were able to get 25 to 30 miles per gallon with little or no trouble. It is rumored that the major oil companies, in order to boost gasoline sales, bought all the patents for those engines, and removed them from the market. These same oil companies, who recently registered near record quarterly earnings, are crying that they are the only ones really being hurt by the petroleum shortage and the attempts to control it. If they truly want to help take off some of the pressure, will they support my proposal?

Every antipollution device and luxury convenience item we install on our cars is just another factor in decreasing our gas mileage. The Environmental Protection Agency has announced that emission control devices reduce oil economy by an average of 7 percent, air conditioning by 9 percent, and automatic transmissions by 5 to 6 percent. Let us do some serious thinking, apply a little commonsense, and meet this energy crisis head-on. If we double the performance of gasoline engines, our consumption will be cut in half.

It looks as though we will have to accept some form of gasoline rationing in the near future. Of the various methods being discussed, there is one to which I am unequivocally opposed: a large increase in the gasoline tax. This type of tax is automatically regressive. The people who could least afford to pay the increased price are the ones who would be hit the hardest. In the long run, the tax increase method would have the least effect upon conserving fuel.

CRIME CONTROL NO. 11

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the number of crimes committed in this country has been rising far faster than the population during the past several years. Yet, despite this enormous growth of crime there are those who think the victims or potential victims of criminals should be disarmed. Disarmament of the innocent, we are told illogically, will decrease crime. However, the persons advocating disarmament of the innocent have said very little about restraining the criminals; in fact, those who favor restrictions on the innocent are quite often the same people who believe that criminals should be rewarded by the erection of luxurious country-club motels in which criminals may be "rehabilitated." This reversal of morality is called liberalism, and it has been the cause of the growth of crime in this country. The liberals are determined to make crime pay—and they have largely succeeded.

I adamantly oppose gun controls precisely because they will make crime pay more than it does already. I believe and have always believed that crime should not pay—and that an armed citizenry is one of the most effective ways of insuring that crime will not pay. My point is well illustrated by the following article from the Detroit Free Press, October 10, 1973.

BURGLAR AND BANDIT ARE KILLED

A householder killed a burglar and a bar owner killed a bandit in separate incidents in Detroit only five minutes apart early Tuesday.

The unidentified burglar was slain by Ronald Goodwin, 19, in Goodwin's home at 1881 Hull at 1:20 a.m.

Goodwin found a rear window in his home broken when he arrived home about 11 p.m. He notified police, who came and made a report on the break-in.

He told police that he was watching television later when he heard noises at the rear of the house. He investigated and saw a man climb through the window.

Goodwin obtained a 12-gauge shotgun. The burglar turned to hand a pistol to an accomplice outside Goodwin said. The accomplice saw Goodwin and aimed the pistol at him.

Goodwin fired once, striking the first burglar in the upper right back. The man's companion fled.

The burglar was pronounced dead at the scene.

In the second slaying, at 1:25 a.m. in the West Detroit Bar at 2533 Woodward, witnesses told police that two bandits entered the bar.

One pulled a gun on a bartender, Peter Polonis, 50, and took Polonis' revolver from the bartender's belt.

The second man leaped over the bar and began emptying the till.

At that moment the bar owner, Richard Paquin, 41, came out of a rear room and fired once, hitting the second man in the abdomen. The first bandit fled.

The bandit was pronounced dead on arrival at Detroit General Hospital.

FARM CITY WEEK

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Ed Maudlin, a long-time friend of agriculture from Town Creek, Ala., addressed the Birmingham Kiwanis Club in connection with their annual farm-city week.

Mr. Maudlin's remarks are so timely that I feel they merit the reading by the Members of this body and I am pleased to place them in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

ADDRESS TO BIRMINGHAM KIWANIS CLUB BY
ED MAUDLIN

On behalf of myself and farmers everywhere, I want to express my appreciation to you gentlemen and to all Kiwanians for your traditional annual recognition of agriculture through the designation of Farm-City week and your efforts to keep open the lines of communication and understanding between rural and urban America, in this manner. While all our aspirations and dreams for a more gracious society are the same, there are bound to be significant differences between your immediate problems and even your lifestyle and those of your friends who live, as I do, in rural Alabama and operate its farms.

Recognizing this, your program chairman, Carl Happer, has asked me to visit with you today about what is going on in rural Alabama and to share with you some of my views as to what the future might hold in store for us all. Let's begin our visit by thinking briefly about what has been happening just within the lifespan of most of us here today.

Many rural areas of the state which were heavily dependent on farming alone have experienced large declines in total population and purchasing power and the attendant loss in political influence. Just in the two decades since 1952, Alabama has lost more than one-half million of our rural citizens to other states. This mass migration, described in a study by the University of Alabama as the flight from the soil has already resulted in the loss of two seats in the Congress of the United States from Alabama—a political loss which adversely affects our urban citizens as well.

So severe is the impact of our loss in population that if you made a calculation beginning with the 1950 census figures and added all births and subtracted all deaths within our State since that date, the net result would be a figure equivalent to the present population of Alabama plus the added population of a city the size of Atlanta proper. Think of the social and economic loss to our state because of this drastic and, I believe unnecessary, depopulation of our rural areas—a loss we can never make up.

Why has it happened—why must it go on? These are the questions we in Alabama must find the answers for, if our state is to maintain its relative economic and political importance in this nation and the world.

Why must our Alabama farms continue to disappear at the rate of over 5,000 per year? Why must some of our finest, most patriotic and God-fearing citizens be driven off their land where they have known a cherished and respected way of life and into the cities that can only provide ghettos and welfare roles? Why must local business firms disappear from the rural scene in numbers so large as to cause the per capita cost of maintaining necessary local public services such as roads,

schools, mail deliveries and electricity to be raised to prohibitive levels? Why must those left on the land suffer the personal hardships of being stranded in rural areas where there is little or no demand for their services and where depopulation has caused local governments to be hard pressed to raise the funds necessary for continued functioning, much less provide quality services?

Why must we, you and I, who like to think of ourselves as the responsible citizens of Alabama, continue to condone such grave wastes in human resources, as the jamming of rural Americans into the large metropolitan centers only to have them cause even more serious and costly problems of traffic congestion, air and water pollution, increased criminal activity, worsened race relations and swollen welfare roles?

It has been said that "land without people is a wilderness and people without land is a mob." Surely there is a better way than creating wilderness out of our once fertile fields and making mobs out of our displaced citizens. Surely this country must have something better to offer our citizens, both farm and city, than the prospect of more of the same.

I say to you, my city friends, the better way lies with the quality of rural life. Our own noble Alabama farm folk are just like people everywhere—they would rather live in the fresh air, on their own soil, enjoying the gifts of God and nature, provided they could once again expect the economic opportunity to provide their families with the quality of life enjoyed by their fellow citizens in the suburbs.

Quality rural life begins with economic opportunity. A day's pay for a day's work. Automobiles and the gas they burn, television sets and the electric power they consume, health care with its medical bills, all cost the rural American just as much as his city cousins.

Yet most urban workers have higher returns per hour of labor than most rural workers. And, almost all urban workers enjoy greater purchasing power per hour of labor than do their brothers who diligently till the soil to produce the food and fiber so vital to the well being, let alone the safety and security of this great country.

Now, please don't misunderstand me, I am happy to see my urban friends receive good pay, if for no other reason, simply so they can buy more of what we farmers grow. But my point is that quality rural life, equal quality, is necessary to save our country from the wilderness of rural depopulation and the mobs of urban overpopulation.

While rural population has declined so markedly in recent years, the actual farm population has declined even more critically. During the decade from 1960 to 1970, when urban population swelled by 19 per cent, rural population fell off 4 per cent, and actual farm population dropped a whopping 38 per cent. Here in Alabama studies by Senate agriculture economists reveal that this state's total farms have dropped to an alltime historic low of only 76,000 working farms in 1973. This compares to approximately 250,000 Alabama farms scarcely more than 30 years ago—an average loss of 5,000 farms per year for over three decades. Just over twenty years ago, Alabama planted more than two million acres to cotton—this year we will harvest less than one-half million acres of cotton, a 75% reduction since 1949.

Certainly, it doesn't take a professionally trained economist to look at these figures and determine why your wives should indeed be concerned over the price of meat and groceries. Looking ahead just a few years further with this continuing trend, they can foresee something much more serious than even high prices with which to concern themselves—the prospect of no meat, not

enough groceries at any price. The prospect of nobody left on the farms to produce the abundance of food and fiber which this country and its people have come to take for granted.

Commodity prices in recent months have indeed skyrocketed in the world's futures exchanges. New York cotton, Chicago soy beans, Tokyo beef and Russian wheat prices have all set record levels this year—won't that make the farmers prosperous you ask, won't that stop the attrition of our farms? Surely prosperous farmers don't abandon their land you say, and to that extent, you are correct.

The facts are that across the board inflation unbridled by sensible public policies, an unprecedented world demand for wheat, feed grains and meat, coupled with a long-time public policy of imposed deferred maintenance on our farms caused by sustained low farm prices has brought us for the first time in this generation to the brink of food shortages.

It is true, food prices resulting from these factors have gone up, month by month, day by day and every family—city and farm alike—feels the impact on the pocketbook. And even though everything else has gone up too, a clamor has arisen, making out the farmer as the villain solely responsible for rising food costs.

As responsible citizens, I am sure that you here today have no desire to engage in the luxury of wantonly blaming any particular segment of our economy for our problems to the exclusion of all others.

Rather I know that you feel as I do, that thoughtful farmers, business and professional people, our public servants, everyone that is truly concerned must work together to seek, to find a remedy.

All of us here I am sure recognize that it is in the total national interest to evolve public policies for agriculture that will continue to assure this nation an abundance of food and fiber and to prevent the grave national risk of potential shortages such as we have recently faced. But to do this, we must abandon some of the false gospels of the past which have forced our farmers into a continuous posture of deferred maintenance because of economic strictures that have also caused agriculture's human resources to so rapidly disappear.

The archaic policies of enforced poverty that have prevailed by the coupling of unrealistically low price supports with burdensome surpluses for so long that we have over-depleted our agricultural plant must be abandoned.

We must, this country must, if we are to continue to be the best-fed for the least-cost nation in the world, adopt long-range public policy that is keyed to demand, assures stable production, and provides sustained adequate income for the farmer who is prudent with his investment, energetic with his labors and productive with his resources.

A prosperous agriculture is necessary for the Quality of Rural Life which is the only answer to alleviate the conditions of the past which we have mentioned.

Now, in the remaining time let's think about some of the fascinating things which the future can hold and some of the really great things agriculture can do for this country.

This country, with its agricultural plant properly functioning, can produce enough wheat to feed us all and enough more to export twice that much. We can grow enough soy beans for all our needs and still sell an equal amount abroad. We can pick all the cotton our domestic mills choose to spin and still earn a billion dollars from overseas sales if we would but reestablish our dependable supplier reputation. Half our beef hides are available for overseas markets. We can grow three times as much rice as we normally eat.

And, we can do all of this with less than 5 per cent of our people while it takes more than one-third of the population of Russia to produce a scant supply of food and fiber for its domestic consumption.

Agriculture is truly this nation's largest industry and is America's largest dollar earner abroad with farm crop exports now representing more than 20% of all U.S. exports.

Indeed agriculture has become the brightest spot in our international trade picture; it contributed a surplus of \$5.6 billion to the nation's trade balance last year—a time when non-agricultural trade was running in the hole by more than \$9 billion.

Too few people seem to understand that this surplus—this favorable balance of trade—is the key to the ability to buy freely on the world market. If we expect to continue to buy in the world market we must sooner or later sell as much as we buy. Now only agriculture in our economy has the ability to make that contribution.

Farm crop exports last year were enough to pay for all our coffee, tea, rubber, bananas and all other agricultural imports and still leave us with \$4.5 billion in purchasing power abroad left over. This was enough to offset the two-billion dollar oil import deficit with \$2.5 billion more to apply to the cost of imported electronics and automobiles.

Scientists so desperately concerned with the energy crisis (destined to be a part of our lives for years to come) have determined that because the chief source of energy used in the production of cotton comes from the radiant sun, the nourishing earth and the refreshing rains that cotton production consumes only one-tenth as much commercial energy as does synthetic fiber production.

The Japanese who have the reverse problem of this country's surplus deficit are continually searching for ways to spend or invest the enormous accumulation of dollars which they have earned from the sale of their goods to America. This has resulted in many changes in their habits and customs, including a tremendous stimulation in their appetite for beef which costs ten times as much in Tokyo as it does in Birmingham.

Their ingenious way of satisfying this appetite includes buying our beef carcasses on the west coast, having them boned out and the beef air freighted to Japan. Air shipment is economical because the depressurized freight compartments of their big jets are naturally refrigerated by high altitude temperatures. As they gradually relax their own beef import restrictions, the oriental appetite for U.S. beef promises to grow into a fantastic market.

Contract selling, which has attracted so much attention in the news media this year due to conflicts arising from the phenomenal increase in prices after the spring cotton contracts were made between the farmers and the mills has not always been available to our growers. Properly handled between responsible growers and reputable spinners, this marketing tool provides an innovation which could have lasting benefits for the cotton industry. It should afford the mills the expectancy of a dependable supply of cotton and it should provide the farmer with an opportunity to select with increased latitude that time of the year to fix his price which he deems to be most favorable to him. Heretofore, he has oftentimes had to pick his cotton, then go, hat-in-hand, to the buyer during the rush of the harvest season and ask how much will you give?

Hopefully, you will agree that farmers deserve the right just the same as other segments of the economy to become price-makers instead of being merely price-takers.

We have all noticed the extremely high prices quoted on the various commodity exchanges for certain crops this year. But do we all realize that only farm prices, if they

go up then they always come down. Cotton went up to over 90 cents per pound then it went down to 60 cents per pound. Fifty years ago, in the 1920's, cotton was 40c a pound. Thirty years later in the early 1950's, it reached that level again but in recent years cotton prices have been so disastrously low that farmers were easy picking for the contractors who offered 30c this spring. So, most Alabama cotton growers will not benefit from the temporary high prices of 1973. Soy beans went up to \$10.00 per bushel earlier this year; now as we gather our beans, they are bringing \$5.00 per bushel.

This is the nature of farm crop prices. But not the farmers costs. His tractor prices go up in cost to him, but they never go down. We have a small farm equipment dealership which I have been involved with for nearly a quarter of a century now. Never during that entire time has the price of a tractor or a piece of equipment gone down. A cotton picker which fifteen years ago was selling for \$7,500 is now more than \$30,000. The cost of taxes, electricity, labor, fuel, fertilizer, chemicals and all the other inputs which the farmer must buy from others to make his crops go up and up but never comes down.

But one thing he knows for sure, if cattle go up, they will certainly come down; if cotton goes up it will surely come down. It always has. For the farmer, the law of gravity works only on the crops he sells, but never on the supplies he buys.

This defiance of that law with the accompanying ever increasing input costs finds our farmers and rural businesses with an insatiable need for additional capital.

Recognizing this need and understanding the unavailability of capital in the rural areas, Congress passed the Rural Areas Development Act of 1972. As Carl mentioned, I was privileged to serve on Senator Talmadge's advisory task force seeking ways to implement this legislation.

As with many other innovative measures, the problem arose as how best such a program could be effected without being structured so as to become too complicated for the local banker to administer and for the local borrower to understand. Hopefully this obstacle has been overcome. If the administration should at some future date see fit to release the funds which have been congressionally appropriated but administratively impounded, the necessary seed money will then inaugurate a program that will bring the capital starved rural borrowers and the capital rich money markets together on a basis that should be equitable for both.

In closing, I ask you too keep in mind that farm programs in the past, though usually thought of as methods to increase farm income, have actually been as much or more a system that has resulted in cheap food for American consumers. Without price supports there would have been inadequate production and without production controls there could have been unmanageable surpluses.

If this nation is to continue to be the best fed and best clothed, and if our people are to continue to spend less of their net take-home pay for food and fiber than any nation in the world ever in history; then certainly, the power of public policy must be used to sustain the independent farmer in our economy which is otherwise so strongly organized. Ours is an economy in which almost all other production is planned, where most marketings are regulated, and where prices are administered and most other profits are by fiat added on to the cost of production.

The ten million people on the two million individually owned farms remaining in this country have no way to independently plan for the national production needed, no way to regulate their markets, or to administer their prices and consequently no farmer

acting alone has the capability of adding a profit to his cost of production.

Hopefully, I have helped you to understand why Alabama is losing 5,000 farms and tens of thousands of our rural citizens each year.

Effecting a remedy is a problem worthy of the attention of us all.

It has been a pleasure to be with you and see so many old friends, to meet new ones and I applaud all Kiwanians for your interest in the challenges facing agriculture.

RESOLUTION NO. 221

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1973, children from sections of the country labeled "poverty areas" are receiving the benefits of special educational programs and projects while those children from low-income families not residing in these areas are deprived of such benefits.

Because this law seems grossly unjust and in need of revision, the Council of the City of Philadelphia has adopted a resolution in favor of amending title I to include other low-income areas in addition to the present designated poverty areas.

I enter into the RECORD a copy of the resolution which was adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on November 1, 1973.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION No. 221

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, approved June 28, 1973, to include other areas in addition to the poverty areas as designated under Title I which deprive, limit or deny educational benefits to those school children not included in the poverty area designation.

Whereas, There are families of low income levels living in areas not designated as poverty area residents whose children are being deprived of the special education programs available only under Title I; and

Whereas, The children now being bused from designated poverty area schools to schools outside their area are being deprived of the special educational programs provided under Title I; and

Whereas, Schools declared ineligible for Title I funds are now depriving many school children of the benefits of the special projects and programs; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, approved June 28, 1973, to include other areas in addition to the designated poverty areas so that Title I programs and projects are not denied those school children not included in the designated areas under the Act.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House, President pro-tem of the Senate, and the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives representing Philadelphia in the Congress of the United States.

MARTHA GRIFFITHS—"DOES ANYBODY CARE ABOUT THE MIDDLE CLASS?"

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, an article was brought to my attention that I believe captures much of the true spirit of one of our most able Members. It appeared 2 weeks ago in the Pittsburgh Press, and it concerns the social philosophy of our colleague from Michigan's 17th District, MARTHA GRIFFITHS.

I have had the privilege to serve alongside her on the House Ways and Means Committee for the past 9 years. Thus, I have not only benefited from her extensive insight into economic problems but also have been continually amazed at her ability to consistently find the heart of any legislative issue.

Since I know that this article will be of considerable interest to all my colleagues in the House, I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

DOES ANYONE CARE ABOUT THE MIDDLE CLASS?

(By Alan D. Haas)

Our federal system of benefits provides a multiplicity of subsidies for the poor and a variety of income tax breaks to the rich, but the bulk of middle-class Americans—those earning \$10,000 to \$25,000—get little, if any, help from Washington, D.C., according to Rep. Martha W. Griffiths, D-Mich., a veteran of nearly 20 years in Congress.

"Even worse," claims Mrs. Griffiths, "these middle-income earners are paying the superlion's share of the nation's taxes. In these inflationary times, the family in the middle is the victim of staggering income inequities fomenting justifiable outrage and discontent."

The Michigan congresswoman is chairman of the Joint Senate-House Fiscal Policy subcommittee which is studying the problem and looking for ways to ease the burden on middle-class wage earners. "We are dangerously close to a political revolution in America," Mrs. Griffiths says, in a voice charged with anger, "unless we can provide suitable remedies that will enable the backbone American—factory worker, white collar person or professional—to pay his bills, retain adequate purchasing power and avoid excessive debts."

A massive study by Mrs. Griffiths' subcommittee documents the morass into which well-intentioned bureaucrats and legislators have led us by planning social programs on a piecemeal basis. "At the present time," the congresswoman observes, "we have 10 legislative committees and 11 executive departments running entrenched social programs without anyone capable of seeing the overall picture. What we really need is a central federal computer that could analyze and evaluate each new program as to how it affects every economic or social grouping in the country."

The myth that there exists in America a broad, comfortable middle class of two-car families, with color TV and luxurious suburban homes does not hold up. Only 30 per cent of U.S. families own a second car, and many have none. The median value of a single-family, owner occupied home in this country is around \$17,000. The House Banking Committee recently estimated that half of all

American households could not afford a mortgage on even a \$20,000 home.

"Federal studies have shown that many American families make it into the \$10,000 and over income bracket only when the wife works, and the husband may be moonlighting on a second job as well. Two of every three families in the \$10,000 to \$20,000 category require a minimum of two breadwinners," says Mrs. Griffiths. "We cannot continue to logically press for justice for minority groups in this nation, unless we at the same time provide for a more equitable distribution of wealth among all segments of the population."

The economic crunch operates in many ways and almost all of them put both ends of the financial scale against the middle. Here's a sampling of inequities that Mrs. Griffiths decries:

Taxes. A mythical urban families of four with a salary income of \$10,971 pays about \$1,800 in taxes and Social Security payments, leaving it with a disposable income of approximately \$9,171 to cover food, housing, medical bills, transportation, clothing, insurance, etc. Considering all the benefits available, the average urban family of four—with nobody employed—comes out about two-thirds as well financially. "The disincentive to work under these conditions is very real. The U.S. tax structure, in effect, penalizes the working stiff, and rewards idleness," Mrs. Griffiths laments.

PENALIZED FOR MARRIAGE

Working wives are also discriminated against by tax laws. A woman earning \$14,000 married to a man with the same income will owe an extra \$84 annually in federal income tax for the privilege of being husband and wife.

"I know of at least one couple in my own constituency who got divorced and now live together, thereby saving \$1,000 in taxes," Mrs. Griffiths said.

When each spouse earns \$10,000, the tax equals that of a family in which the one working spouse earns \$20,000. But the two-earner family has less taxpaying ability because it lacks the value of the nonemployed wife's untaxed labor in the home.

"Any tax reform worthy of the name would have to include the closing of some of the \$22 billion in loopholes for the wealthy. But unless the wealthy suddenly acquire less clout in the nation's capital or the middle class adds some, this is a doubtful prospect."

Health Care. "At the present time, middle-class persons are paying (through taxes) for better health care for the poor than they can afford for themselves. Our subcommittee found a situation in New Jersey where a mother with three children went on welfare, then found a job paying \$900 a month. However, she was still entitled under New Jersey law to \$19 worth of welfare assistance each month, which also meant that she was eligible for Medicaid for her family, as well as free milk, school lunches, subsidized housing and other benefits."

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

The congresswoman has introduced a national health insurance plan measure in the House of Representatives that is essentially the same as the one that Sen. Ted Kennedy is pushing in the Senate. "The only answer to the present medical care inequities is to treat everyone equally and to provide total health insurance for all, regardless of one's ability to pay," she says.

Housing. "Present housing regulations are particularly discriminatory against women—regardless of their financial resources—simply because they are members of the fair sex. I have received many complaints from women around the country, divorced and widowed ladies particularly, often with more than adequate resources, who have not been able to purchase homes

simply because the FHA won't guarantee a mortgage for them. I have introduced an amendment to the existing housing legislation to bar this kind of sex discrimination and I am hopeful of passage in this session of the legislature."

Day Care. "Poor and low income families qualify for free federally subsidized day care and their children have first call on the available facilities. Middle-class families can deduct modest amounts for day care expenses if they itemize their deductions. For instance, a family with a \$10,000 income and one child can take a \$95 deduction if it spends \$500 per annum on day care facilities. At the \$18,000 level, day care deductions start to be phased out and at the \$25,000 level, there is no deduction permitted at all."

Social Security. "Many middle-income workers actually gain little or nothing from the years they and their employers contributed to Social Security. In Michigan, a man who has contributed all his working life is entitled to minimum benefits of \$250 per month for himself and his wife, plus \$32 a month under the welfare program for the aged poor. A man who never contributed a dime to Social Security can collect a full welfare check of \$282, the same total amount. Thus, the Social Security contributor has nothing extra to show for long years of paying ever-higher payroll taxes."

Unemployment Insurance. "In Minnesota, an unemployed worker with a wife and two children can receive a maximum of \$277 per month in unemployment insurance. However, if such a worker were not eligible for these funds, he could draw \$360 per month under the aid to dependent children program. Once again, the wage earner comes out the loser when contrasted with the poor or out-of-work."

PART-TIME WORK DISCOURAGED

"Additionally, unemployed persons in a number of states are discouraged from taking part-time jobs because their earnings are deducted from their benefits, and after taxes and work expenses they could be worse off financially from having worked part time. Since higher unemployment benefits for those in need could only come from higher tax revenues, there appears to be little likelihood that this inequity will be corrected any time soon," Mrs. Griffiths concludes.

Scholarships and Student Loans. "According to a recent statistic, 62 per cent of families with incomes of \$14,000 to \$18,000 have been unable to save a dime towards sending their kids to college. With the cost of a college education now estimated at \$12,000 to \$20,000, it is easy to see that the middle class is just as disadvantaged in this area as the poor."

Retirement Pensions. "For the middle-class worker, up in years and facing retirement, the final and best hope for fiscal independence is his pension. Once again he finds the federal establishment has failed to adequately protect his rights. In the straw that breaks the camel's back, tens of thousands of corporate employees have discovered that the pension they counted on is not there. Perhaps he or she is fired a week or a year before completing eligibility. Or the company he worked for 20 or 30 years has gone bust. Or the pension fund itself was mismanaged and his payments reduced. Some Washington legislators have been aware for years that private pension funds require federal minimum standards to protect workers, but reform has been held back partially because of the complexity of the matter. Now, at last, after more than three years of committee work, Congress appears to be moving towards passage of an adequate private pension bill."

"Legislators like myself, military men, and the like all have generous pension plans, which cannot suffer default due to federal guarantees. But the private citizen is still

vulnerable. In America we virtually worship fairness, but too often we have not been fair to our most deserving citizens," declares Mrs. Griffiths.

FM RADIO—A GROWING INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Burns of WMCB of Michigan City, Ind., recently published a most interesting article in Broadcast Management magazine entitled "How We Staked Out Our FM Audience."

Mr. Burns describes the rapid growth in recent years in FM programming nationwide and especially the experience of WMCB-FM in Michigan City, Ind.

Mr. Burns' article is most interesting reading for anyone interested in radio programming and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

HOW WE STAKED OUT OUR FM AUDIENCE

(By Thomas Burns)

FM radio in recent years has emerged as a major medium. Many say it will surpass AM radio in audience reached and revenue generated during this decade. In some major markets, FM stations have overtaken AM in audience rating. In Michigan City, Indiana, where the writer operates WMCB (FM), our billings have nearly quadrupled since 1969.

Although commercial FM began 31 years ago, it is only recently that marketing concepts have been applied to selling FM. In this paper, I will describe marketing channels for smaller-market FM stations. Since we are selling a non-tangible service, not a physical product, it is necessary to describe the entire marketing program and relate the channels to the other elements of marketing. In addition, two separate, but sometimes overlapping, channels must be considered: audience channels and advertiser channels.

Until about 1966, FM was a dormant medium. Its growth was halted during World War II, and in the post-war period it was bypassed for development of television. In the early 1950s, an engineer at WDWS, Champaign, Illinois, forgot to turn on the FM that duplicated AM programming. Hours passed before a listener called to inquire why the FM station was not broadcasting. The few independently-operated FM stations often sold time in blocks of 15 minutes to an hour at very low rates to anyone they could get to buy it. FM receiver ownership was very low and programming, when not a duplication of AM, was the lowest-cost material available. There were no systematic efforts to market FM . . . and no one cared.

But slowly in the 1950s a demand began for program material for hi-fi and later stereo systems. Discs and tapes were expensive, and an alternate, inexpensive source was needed. As a result, FM tuners were added to sound systems, and inexpensive imported FM table radios became available.

By 1966 a second generation of FM stations came on the air to meet the hi-fi and stereo needs. The same year survey firms began measuring demographic audience structures, and demographically-programmed FM stations, such as WFMT, Chicago, began showing up in these surveys—although with limited audiences at first. The reason appeared to be that hi-fi and stereo enthusiasts were very specific in the types of music they liked, and listened to the stations which came closest to fulfilling their listening tastes. By

comparison, the mass-market AM stations, with something-for-everyone formats, did not appeal to the same extent to specific demographic groups.

Today more receivers are sold with FM than without. And consulting firms now offer demographically-structured syndicated programming services designed to reach target audiences. Some have been quite successful: Stereo Radio Productions Ltd., for example, achieved first place ratings among all stations, AM and FM, in Grand Rapids, Michigan, with WOOD-FM, and in West Palm Beach, Florida with WEAT-FM.

In these cases, and in Miami and Boston too (where FM is in first place), the programmer has selected a specific audience and developed and broadened it to exceed any other demographic audiences in those markets. As Kotler points out in *Marketing Management*, a smaller competitor should attempt to segment the market rather than to compete head-on with dominant firms.

As the programming was being demographically developed, it could be sold on a demographic basis. Recently ABC published a survey of product preferences of persons who listened to stereo rock on FM. The study is being actively used by ABC-FM salesmen in calling on clients whose product types have a high appeal for stereo rock listeners.

In describing marketing channels of small market FM, I will draw upon my experiences in Michigan City and generalize them to this class of station. Although demographic programming has been slower in being applied in smaller markets, I believe there are advantages to such segmentation. In addition, it is often possible to redefine and expand a smaller market geographically. Thus it is possible to create a new service for a new market.

First we defined the geographic market. Although Michigan City has been traditionally considered an isolated market, a major enclosed shopping mall opened several years ago near two converging expressways at the south edge of the city. Between 40 and 60% of the shoppers were found to come from beyond the Michigan City limits. But the long established mass media in Michigan City, a daily newspaper and an AM station, continued to program and sell primarily to Michigan City.

WMCB-FM reaches most of northwest Indiana and southwest Michigan. There are several hundred thousand potential listeners within 30 miles of Michigan City, who shop both in Michigan City and at the businesses in their local communities. Thus, we decided to program our station for this regional market and direct our sales efforts to advertisers within about 30 miles of Michigan City, as well as those within Michigan City. (Thirty miles is a marginal limit for sales and programming.) Since WMCB-FM was a new medium, there were no traditions to alter. We could provide news, weather, sports, and features for listeners throughout the area without offending Michigan City listeners.

Second, we examined the census figures and found there was a large potential audience in the 21-to-45 age category. Our surveys indicated that WLS, Chicago, was dominant among teens, a number of background music FM stations were splintering the older audience for FM, and the Michigan City AM stations reached mostly persons over 45. Thus we structured our selection of music for the 21-to-45 age category by playing contemporary, popular music and directed our regional news, weather reports, sports coverage, and features to persons in that age category. We also discovered that no other station, AM or FM, in our desired coverage area was editorializing. We added that feature.

Prior to these modifications in the audience marketing channels, the station, under previous ownership, had been one of a num-

ber of FM stations broadcasting background music to this area. Many of these stations, broadcasting from Chicago, had better programming and better signals throughout much of the regional area we wanted to serve. These facts reinforced our decision to abandon background music. Further, the background music listener tends to listen to the station with the fewest commercials.

While we were developing the audience marketing channels directed to young adult listeners and promoting the audience on-the-air and through newspaper ads, we were simultaneously developing advertiser marketing channels.

We were actively calling upon clients within 30 miles of Michigan City whose products or services would have strong appeal to young adults. We showed them how our station could fill advertising needs.

We contacted national accounts where there was some logical tie-in with our regional area and audience age. We worked through local dealers or distributors. We avoided a shotgun approach.

In the last year we have added a national representative and have joined a group of stations in Michigan and Indiana who sell advertising jointly.

Our local and regional sales efforts have been quite satisfactory. In addition to in-town business, about a third of our business comes from advertisers in the surrounding region. We have gained some national business, but there is still a great deal of prejudice against FM among advertising agencies. They will buy with a strong recommendation from a local dealer. That is the only profitable means to pursue national agency business at this time. One day agencies will discover FM, and it will suddenly become the "in" thing. (My experience with agency people is that most tend to follow the herd.) Our efforts through our national representative and the group of stations has produced little yet, but I believe there is great potential there.

During the time we have been pursuing our defined channels we have been gradually expanding our scope of programming. We have softened and added a larger variety of contemporary music and mixed in lightly some music dating back to the 1950s. In addition our news, editorials, sports and weather coverage has gained response from older people, too. We have developed additional regional programs such as beauty pageants and election night coverage for both Indiana and Michigan, which sold easily to regional advertisers.

When we began in 1969, WMOB-FM had little audience an FM set penetration was about 70% of homes in the area. Our present surveys show we are the dominant FM station with an early 50% lead in listener preference over the second place FM station, which broadcasts background music. FM set penetration has climbed to about 90%. As audience loyalty continues to develop and set penetration nears 100%, I believe we can further broaden our audience appeal and advertising sales. We also plan a power increase, not so much to reach farther, but to increase our signal level in the areas we already serve.

We stimulated audience channels through occasional contests such as one in which listeners were rewarded for identifying sounds unique to this area, through saluting on the air a different local person daily, through on-the-air promotion, call-in programs, newspaper ads and mail directed to community leaders.

Advertising channels are stimulated with yearly demographic surveys of audience, documented success stories in letter form from advertisers, news releases public appearances of station personnel and by active participation in many community projects.

In smaller markets that have a number of competing radio signals, I believe segmentation of audience is as necessary as it is in a larger market. Only in isolated, single-sta-

tion markets can a station be all things to all people. Too, I believe there are many markets where an FM station operator has an opportunity to redefine the geographic limits of the market as we did here. FM signal coverage is more constant than is AM coverage and is often greater. If a broader area than the local city can be served, and if there are no long-standing ties of the station to the central city, why confine the service area? In addition to Michigan City, I know of stations in Aurora, Illinois, and Traverse City, Michigan, which have successfully programmed and sold to a broadened geographic market.

In this story I have discussed the marketing channels, audience and advertising channels, and related them to the other elements of the marketing mix. Often the distinction is blurred since we are not transporting and distributing a product or service in the traditional sense. We have no inventory problems, unless you count unsold time; we have no distributors in our local area, unless you count the few local ad agencies; and we have no dealer network. In our business the channels become an inseparable part of the whole. But that is what makes it so interesting, and challenging.

DANGERS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT COMPUTER BANKS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an editorial which appeared in the San Jose News, November 7, pointing out the dangers of law enforcement computer banks. As you may know, I have introduced legislation which would limit the dissemination of arrest records, H.R. 187, but as the editorial and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals have indicated, we need to go further than this basic protection. My Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights, will be looking into this subject in greater depth to insure increased protection of individual, civil liberties.

The editorial follows:

PLACING A REIN ON DATA BANKS

There have been several unfortunate incidents of persons being arrested and held in jail for several hours because of inaccurate information in police computer files.

Each of us lives increasingly with the fear of how outdated or inaccurate information, centrally collected in vast data banks, might adversely affect our lives.

The concern is not misdirected. The question is what to do about it. Part of the answer is to carefully regulate what type of information may be gathered about American citizens, to severely limit unnecessary dissemination that invades privacy—and to insist that an individual is not housed by inaccurate or outdated information.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals has recommended that law enforcement computer banks periodically be purged of such data and that persons cleared of wrongdoing be allowed to retrieve their police records.

A similar recommendation was made earlier this year by California Atty. Gen. Evelle Younger.

The recommendations merit prompt consideration, both at the federal and state level. Basic civil liberties are involved. Guidelines

on security of the files, protection of privacy, and purging of outdated, inaccurate or irrelevant information cannot be left to chance or whim.

MAYBE ENERGY CRISIS WILL TEACH US A LESSON

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very hard-hitting, sharp editorial carried in the Illinois Suburbanite Economist on November 14 on the subject of the energy crisis is well worth reading by all of us.

The article expressed the fact that the current energy crisis could be handled more effectively and it makes several very practical solutions to be made to curb this growing national problem.

The article follows:

WILL AN ENERGY CRISIS TEACH US THE LESSON?

We are the world's only nation going to the poorhouse riding in automobiles, this country's celebrated cowboy said in the early 1930s.

Will Rogers' puzzlement would have turned into disbelief in more recent years as the country with "the most" has been agonizing through a host of similar paradoxes.

We have been the world's only nation with tens of thousands of highly educated technicians and scientists whom we could not employ; the world's strongest military power but we were bogged down for over 20 years in a war with a small, backward country in Southwest Asia; the country with the most comfortable and fanciest skyscrapers but we still have millions of people buried in the slums; the world's only nation where we can buy new cars as often as people in other advanced countries change suits and still find it increasingly difficult to reach our jobs in the morning.

And now, to top it all, the kingsize paradox: We are the richest nation in the history of this planet so far but we will soon be unable to heat our homes and drive to a forest preserve for a few hours of relaxation. Fuel rationing is coming, soon, the government has told us and we have succumbed to the belt-tightening as if it were inevitable.

But in the midst of calls for an austerity program to conserve on fuel and to get the most out of existing energy resources, the administrators of our government failed to tell us one thing:

It is not the boycott by the Arab states (suppliers of a meager 6 per cent of our oil needs) that has caused the present crisis.

It is lack of planning by the less-than-bright boys in Washington that has created this latest crisis.

The Arab boycott simply brought to an explosive point a crisis that has been bubbling for almost a decade and erupted quite visibly in 1969.

In the years to come, history will judge government administrators severely for inexcusable shortsightedness. They have sat around carefree showing greater eagerness to deal with politics rather than running the country.

For an entire decade now, economists and conservationists have been pointing out that growth cannot be sustained indefinitely since all of our known resources of energy are finite. Our resources have been dwindling and our economy cannot continue to grow without energy.

In 1969, Texas and Louisiana oil fields that

produce two thirds of the oil in the U.S. suffered a reserve loss of more than 45 million gallons of oil, the largest decline of crude oil reserve in history.

Crude oil stocks of the 10 largest companies in the U.S. were down in 1972 and we were faced with higher gasoline prices early last spring. But the government steadfastly refused to face up to the real issue which is the decline of the existing energy sources.

Now, under the gun of the Arab states, the President goes on TV and announces the launching of Project Independence.

Well, that is a step that should have been taken years ago as part of a long-term, unhurried plan. What the present condition proves is that the government has failed us in the most profound sense.

It has not deceived us or lied to us. It has ignored us. It has quite clearly failed to fulfill its main obligation which is to plan on a long-term basis. It has humiliated us at a time when the epithet "paper tiger" is still ringing in our ears.

With all its computerized capacity and its hordes of bureaucrats, Washington in the most elementary terms failed to plan for the future.

To be sure, this nation in the past functioned well under pressure, as President Nixon has pointed out. The Project Manhattan and the space program were carried out successfully with little long range planning. Does that mean that we have to operate under such pressure continually?

This latest crisis has assaulted the life of every American with an unprecedented forcefulness and, what is more frustrating in retrospect, it seems the most unnecessary. Depending on its severity, it will affect our lifestyles and our economy beyond anything else since Depression.

Will we ever learn any lessons from our past? Will Washington ever learn to take heed of early warnings?

If not, we may also find ourselves holding another record. We may become the nation on this planet that declined faster than any other, the only civilization that died 200 years after its birth.

PRISON REFORM

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, approximately 14 months ago, as a result of the brutal riots at Attica, national attention focused on prison reform. Since that time, continued prison riots have repeatedly shattered our complacency. They force us to notice what, at best, can be termed subhuman living conditions and treatment. Many of us are guilty of ignoring the tragedies produced by the continual debasement which goes on in our prisons. As a nation, we have done little to address the problems which foment such furious outbreaks. Filthy conditions, savage brutality, and disregard for the sanctity of human life, and lack of creative and purposeful rehabilitation programs continue to plague most inmates.

The definition of cruel and unusual punishment has been debated at length before and after the Supreme Court's decision on capital punishment. It seems to me that for some, capital punishment would almost seem preferable to the treatment and neglect suffered in prison

by such individuals as Jackson "Curly" Fee who killed himself this October in the U.S. penitentiary in Marion, Ill., after being beaten by prison guards and isolated in a special cell. The torment and anguish suffered by these men surely passes well beyond the intent of the judges who sentenced them.

There are few people in our society today who do not feel threatened by the rising crime rate. A substantial portion of this crime is committed by ex-convicts—which testifies to the failure of rehabilitation programs to adequately induce inmates to lead peaceful lives upon release. It seems to me that the adoption of comprehensive and far-reaching programs of rehabilitation would surely reduce the incidences of crime committed by ex-offenders.

There are some who argue that our prison systems are not so inadequate; that these conditions may not be as critical or as desperate as they have been depicted. However, it would be a mistake to be lulled into a false sense of complacency and to expect that this issue will eventually resolve itself. It is necessary for the Congress to address this issue in a responsible manner and to enact legislation to eliminate the potential for abuses within our prison system.

At this time, I wish to insert a letter sent to me by an inmate of the U.S. Penitentiary in Marion, Ill., and a news item prepared by Earth News. The situation described in the letter from the inmate presents a challenge to our sense of decency and morality. The letter and editorial follow:

HUNGER STRIKE AT MARION

Prisoners at Marion federal penitentiary are continuing a hunger strike that began with the death of a fellow inmate October 22nd.

Prison officials reported that 48-year-old Jackson "Curly" Fee hanged himself in his maximum security cell. Inmates have alleged his death was murder. Several prisoners have written letters that claim Fee was beaten in his cell a week before the apparent suicide. Fee reported that incident to his attorneys and made sworn statements concerning threats that were made against him by prison guards. Jackson Fee had a lawsuit against the officials at the prison and his attorney claimed late last week that there was strong evidence he was beaten before his death last month.

One of Fee's attorneys in that suit, G. Flint Taylor, said the official version of the death may be accurate, but noted that the highest crossbar in Fee's cell was only five-feet seven-inches high. Fee was five-feet five-inches tall—leaving little room for a hanging.

Inmates and attorneys have called for a congressional investigation.

U.S. PENITENTIARY,

Marion, Ill., October 28, 1973.

DEAR SIR: Are you aware that during the last few years in the federal prisons (and some states also) a policy of preventive detention has been put into effect? It used to be that you had to break some rule or regulation—not always, but generally—before you were locked up in the "hole". Not now though; they're putting many of us in the "Long Term Control Unit" indefinitely—not for what we did, but for what we might do. They've even converted normal cell blocks into segregation units to handle the hundreds of prisoners locked up.

On Oct. 22, 1973, a squad of "correctional

officers" armed with clubs, helmets, and plastic shields beat Jackson "Curly" Fee (weight 125-135 lbs.; height 5'6" or 5'7") in cell H-D-17 and dragged him to the "box-car" cells (which are yet more punitive). On Oct. 27, 1973, he was found hanged to death.

Lt. Culley, Manager of this "Long Term Control Unit", wouldn't allow Curly's best friend, Richard Montgomery, to talk with Curly, when he, in a complete reversal of his normal manner, stopped speaking. It was obvious, even to us uneducated prisoners, that there was something seriously wrong with him but our overseers couldn't—or wouldn't—do anything for him.

Under their policy of perpetual lock-up there will be more suicides, self-mutilations, prisoners being driven insane, psychosomatic illnesses, etc. (see the articles in the Kansas City newspapers on the many Leavenworth suicides.) Meanwhile, Norman Carlson, Director of the Prison Bureau, continues to prate his "rehabilitation" theme to the unknowing, or uncaring, public. Congress, of course, continues to vote millions for "Correctional Services"—with over 90 percent spent for guns, bars, locks, Long-Term Control Units, etc. I believe two billion dollars are allocated for constructing new prisons in the near future: to what end—to force, beat, coerce, more good people, like my friend Curly, into suicide?

Since much of my mail "vanishes" (contrary to their own policy statements), I would appreciate a brief acknowledgment of this letter.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

P.S. our cell block is now on a hunger strike—as futile as that may be.

RESOLUTION FOR DR. THOMAS KILGORE, JR.

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

Whereas, Dr. Thomas Kilgore, Jr., has served the Los Angeles Community as Pastor of the Second Baptist Church for the past 10 years and 37 years as a spiritual leader here and throughout the South and East, and,

Whereas, Dr. Kilgore's activities have not been limited to his pastorate, but to the unending struggle for the betterment of mankind during which he organized and led the Prayer Pilgrimage to Washington in 1957 and helped to organize the famous March on Washington in 1963, and,

Whereas, Dr. Kilgore has demonstrated outstanding leadership in other ways, as President of the American Baptist Convention in 1969-70, in the Council of Churches, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Opportunities Industrialization Center, College and Seminary Board of Trustees, and as special advisor of the President of the University of Southern California on community relations.

Therefore, be it known this 20th day of October 1973, that we are in recognition of the enduring accomplishments of Dr. Kilgore and join with his many friends and admirers in paying tribute to him. Be it further resolved that a statement of this Recognition will be placed in the Congressional Record.

ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION OF
THE AMERICAN BICENTENNIAL
COMMISSION OF JACKSONVILLE,
FLA., INC.

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, herewith, I include in the RECORD the articles of incorporation of the American Bicentennial Commission of Jacksonville, Fla. I do this because almost every community in the country will eventually be seeking to set up a similar organization and the inclusion of this document may be of assistance to others who might use it as a format. In doing so I pay particular tribute to George M. Linville of Jacksonville who has ably spearheaded the bicentennial work in the Jacksonville area.

The articles of incorporation of the American Bicentennial Commission of Jacksonville, Fla., Inc. follow:

ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION OF THE AMERICAN
BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION OF JACKSONVILLE,
FLA., INC.

(A corporation not for profit)

We, the undersigned, with other persons, being desirous of forming a corporation for charitable, educational and philanthropic purposes under the provisions of Chapter 617 of the Florida Statutes do agree to the following.

ARTICLE I—NAME

The name of this corporation is The American Bicentennial Commission of Jacksonville, Florida, Inc. The principal office of this corporation in the State of Florida is located in Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida.

ARTICLE II—OBJECTS AND PURPOSES

The general nature of the objects and purposes of this corporation shall be:

1) To promote, conduct, present and operate in the City of Jacksonville, Florida, and in Northeast Florida, celebrations leading up to and commemorating the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the establishment of the United States of America, the American Revolutionary War, the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and in cooperation with other individuals, corporations, commissions or authorities, including but not limited to the St. Augustine Committee for the National Bicentennial, Inc., the Bicentennial Commission of Florida, and the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission of the United States, to provide in Jacksonville, Florida, and Northeast Florida a festival of freedom through the bicentennial era of 1973 to 1987 and to foster and encourage a new spirit of '76 in the people of Northeast Florida. The festival of freedom shall embrace three themes which are:

(a) Heritage '76. A summons to recall our heritage and place in its historical perspective, including the promotion, preservation and dissemination of information relating to the history of Jacksonville, the State of Florida and the United States, the identification, recordation, preservation and renovation of historical sites, structures, folklore and history of Jacksonville, the State of Florida and the United States in order that the people of our community may re-examine our origins, our values, take pride in our previous accomplishments and better understand the meaning and purpose of our social, economic and political environment.

(b) Festival USA shall be the central component of the bicentennial commemorative celebration evoking the spirit of hospitality, exchange of ideas and movement which has characterized American development with its focal point the year 1976 and the day July 4, 1976, and including appropriate celebrations each year from 1973 through 1987.

(c) Horizons '76, looking toward America's third century, is a challenge to every American to undertake or to participate in programs and projects which manifest the pride, priorities and hope of his community in a constructive effort to demonstrate concern for and promote the freedom, welfare and happiness of our fellow Americans; to assist in the development of the City of Jacksonville and Northeast Florida as a tourist center; to favorably advertise and promote Jacksonville and its institutions; to promote the general business and orderly growth of the Greater Jacksonville Area; and to cooperate with business and civic organizations in promoting the cultural advancement and economic betterment of Jacksonville and Northeast Florida.

ARTICLE III—POWERS

In order to carry out the general purposes and objects stated above, this corporation shall have all powers granted by law and in addition thereto the following specific powers:

1) To contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, invest and reinvest, the funds of the corporation, and to do all acts and things requisite, necessary, proper, and desirable, to carry out and further the objects and purposes for which this corporation is formed.

2) To act as trustee of funds, or other assets, given for its purposes; to receive by bequest, devise, gift, purchase, or lease, either absolutely or in trust, any property, whether real, personal or mixed; and to administer such property and such trusts; to sell and convey such property, and to invest or reinvest the proceeds from the same, or the proceeds and income therefrom, in such manner, for the purpose of this corporation, as in the discretion of the Board of Directors, will best promote the objects of the corporation.

(a) In each instance where specific instructions shall have been given the corporation by the donor, grantor, testator, or testatrix, as to the disposition of property, or funds, whether such gift, devise, or bequest, shall be absolute or in trust, such gift, devise or bequest shall be placed in a fund to be known as a "designated fund" and the instructions, insofar as the same are legally possible, shall be binding upon the Executive Committee and the corporation, and shall be faithfully performed; provided, if the objects and purposes for which any designated gift was made shall cease to exist then such designated gift, devise, or bequest, shall become part of the undesignated funds or property of the corporation and shall be administered as such.

(b) In the absence of specific directions by the donor, grantor, testator, or testatrix, any gifts, grants, devises and bequests to the corporation shall be known as "undesignated funds" and the distribution of such property and funds, and the income therefrom, shall be made for the purposes of the corporation as the Executive Committee in their discretion shall deem best.

3) To sell, lease, exchange, mortgage, pledge or otherwise dispose of and encumber any real estate or any personal property at any time owned or held by the corporation, and any interest or estate therein or to donate all or any part of such real and personal property, or any interest or estate therein, to the State of Florida, or to any

political subdivision, agency or municipality of the State of Florida or to any educational, historical, charitable or benevolent corporation now or hereafter organized or existing under the laws of the State of Florida, and in connection with the sale, lease, exchange, mortgage, pledge, donation or other disposition of any such real or personal property to impose such restrictions upon the use thereof as the Executive Committee may deem proper.

4) To maintain and manage lands, parks or historical sites or buildings which may be entrusted donated, conveyed or leased by the United States, the State of Florida, or any of its political subdivisions, or by any person, firm, corporation or association, for the purpose of public recreation, environmental protection, preservation of natural features, historic sites, or sites, structures or articles possessing historic value.

5) To borrow money for any of the purposes of the corporation, and to issue bonds, certificates of indebtedness or other obligations therefor, and to secure the same by pledge or mortgage of the whole or any part of the property of the corporation, either real or personal, or both real and personal or mixed, and/or the income therefrom, or to issue notes or other obligations without any such security. To draw, make, accept, endorse, discount, guarantee, execute, and issue promissory notes, bills of exchange, drafts, warrants and all kinds of obligations and certificates and negotiable or transferable instruments.

6) To carry out all or any part of the foregoing objects and purposes as principal, agent, contractor or otherwise, either alone or in conjunction with any person, firm, association or other corporation, public or private; and in carrying on its business and for the purpose of attaining or furthering any of its objects or purposes, to have and maintain offices in Jacksonville, Florida, and other places in the State of Florida, the United States, or foreign countries, as may be necessary; to make and perform such contracts of any kind and description; to do such acts and things, and to exercise any and all such powers, as a natural person could lawfully make, perform, do or exercise, provided, that the same be not inconsistent with the laws of the State of Florida Articles of Incorporation.

7) To do any and all things necessary, suitable, convenient or proper, for, or in connection with, or incidental to, the accomplishment of any of the purposes or the attainment of any one or more of the objects herein enumerated, or designed, directly or indirectly to promote the interest of the corporation, or to enhance the value of any of its properties. To do any and all things and exercise any and all powers which it may now or hereafter, be lawful for the corporation to do or to exercise under the laws of the State of Florida that may now or hereafter be applicable to the corporation; and to do all things incident or necessary to the carrying out of the purposes and objects of this corporation.

ARTICLE IV—MEMBERS

The members of this corporation shall consist of the commissioners listed in the attached Schedule "A", and such other commissioners as may be added from time to time in the manner provided in the by-laws.

ARTICLE V—TERM OF EXISTENCE

This corporation shall exist perpetually.

ARTICLE VI—SUBSCRIBERS

The initial subscribers of this corporation are:

George M. Linville, 6842 Old St. Augustine Rd., Jacksonville, Florida.

Hans G. Tanzler, Jr., Mayor, City of Jacksonville, City Hall, Jacksonville, Florida.

James C. Rinaman, Jr., P. O. Box 447, Jacksonville, Florida.

ARTICLE VII—OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The affairs of this corporation shall be managed by the officers of the corporation and the Executive Committee. The officers of the corporation shall be a President (who shall also be Chairman of the Executive Committee), a Vice President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer (all of whom shall serve as members of the Executive Committee), and such other officers as may be provided in the by-laws.

Members of the Executive Committee in addition to those who serve by virtue of their office as provided herein shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at the pleasure of the President. The names and addresses of the persons who shall serve as the initial officers and members of the Executive Committee until their successors are appointed or elected are:

Office—Name—Address

President (and Chairman of the Executive Committee, George M. Linville, 6842 Old St. Augustine Rd., Jacksonville, Florida.

Vice President and General Counsel, James C. Rinaman, Jr., P. O. Box 447, Jacksonville, Florida.

Secretary, Constance Hansen, Gulf Life Ins. Co., Gulf Life Tower, Jacksonville, Florida.

Treasurer, Rodell Roberts, 330 East Bay Street, Jacksonville, Florida.

Executive Committee Members. The initial members of the Executive Committee shall include the officers listed above and the members of the Board of Directors listed in Article VIII.

ARTICLE VIII—BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The determination of policy matters, identification of goals and objectives, and control over the officers and Executive Committee in the management of the business affairs of the Commission shall be vested in the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors shall consist of the officers and ten directors whose number may be increased according to the by-laws and who shall be elected by the members at the annual meeting or a special meeting called for that purpose. The initial Board of Directors which shall serve until the annual meeting of the corporation in June of 1974 or until their successors are elected or appointed in the interim by the President shall be:

George Linville, Chairman of the Board, 6842 Old St. Augustine Road, Jacksonville, Florida.

James C. Rinaman, Jr., Vice President and General Counsel, P. O. Box 447, Jacksonville, Florida 32201.

Constance Hansen, Secretary, Gulf Life Insurance Company, Gulf Life Tower, Jacksonville, Florida.

Rodell Roberts, Treasurer, 330 East Bay Street, Jacksonville, Florida 32202.

Robert R. Feagin, 1 Riverside Avenue, Jacksonville, Florida 32201.

William W. Gay, 523 Estelle Lane, Jacksonville, Florida 32204.

Harold Gibson, P.O. Box 8000, Jacksonville, Florida 32211.

Ira M. Koger, 3986 Boulevard Center Drive, Jacksonville, Florida 32207.

Donald T. Martin, 500 West Water Street, Room 204, Jacksonville, Florida 32202.

Robert B. Massey, 2434 Atlantic Boulevard, Jacksonville, Florida 32207.

Dr. Paul A. Mori, 3599 University Boulevard South, Jacksonville, Florida 32216.

Fred Rebman, 2037 Main Street North, Jacksonville, Florida 32206.

Christine Schmidt, 4232 Ortega Forest Drive, Jacksonville, Florida 32210.

Dr. Benjamin R. Wygal, Florida Junior College of Jacksonville, Cumberland Campus C-25, Jacksonville, Florida 32205.

ARTICLE IX—ELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS

All officers and directors of the corporation shall be elected as provided in the by-laws.

ARTICLE X—BY-LAWS

The corporation may provide such by-laws for the conduct of its business and carrying out of its purposes and objects as may be deemed necessary from time to time. Upon proper notice the by-laws may be amended, altered or rescinded by a majority vote of the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE XI—AMENDMENTS

These Articles of Incorporation may be amended at any regular meeting or any special meeting of the Commission called for that purpose by a majority vote of those present and voting at such meeting providing that a quorum of at least twenty-five commissioners must be present at such meeting and further provided that written notice that such amendment is proposed and the text of such amendment shall be mailed to the members of the Commission not less than three days prior to any such meeting.

ARTICLE XII—VESTED INTEREST AND COMPENSATION

No members of this corporation shall have any vested right, interest or privilege of, in, or to the assets, functions, objects, or franchises of this corporation, or any right, interest, or privilege which may be transferable or inheritable, or which shall continue if his membership ceases, or while he is not in good standing.

No dividends shall be paid by this corporation and no part of the income of this corporation shall be distributed to its members, commissioners or officers.

No officer or commissioner of this corporation shall receive directly or indirectly any compensation for his services; however, expenses incurred in and about the work of this corporation, or advances made for the account of the corporation, reasonable in character and amount, may be paid by the Treasurer to persons of the aforesaid classes after a statement thereof shall have been submitted to and approved for payment by the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE XIII

The corporation shall provide for and obtain an annual audit by a certified public accountant of the books and records of the corporation immediately after the close of each fiscal year. Such audit and the books and records of the corporation shall at all reasonable times be open for inspection by the public.

ARTICLE XIV—DISSOLUTION

In the event of the dissolution of this corporation, its assets, after payment of all debts and charges of the corporation, and expenses of dissolution, shall be distributed to one or more organizations which have qualified for exemption under Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of the United States as the same may be amended. No part of the net earnings of this corporation shall inure in whole or in part to the benefit of incorporators, private shareholders, or any individuals, nor shall this corporation engage in carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, nor shall it participate in or intervene in (including the publishing or distribution of statements) any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

In witness whereof, the incorporators of this corporation intending in good faith to carry out the purposes and object set forth in these Articles of Incorporation, have hereunto subscribed their names this 8th day of November, 1973.

GEORGE M. LINVILLE.
HANS G. TANZLER, JR.
JAMES C. RINAMAN, JR.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

STATE OF FLORIDA, COUNTY OF DUVAL

Before me, a Notary Public, duly authorized in the state and county named above to take acknowledgments, personally appeared George M. Linville, Hans G. Tanzler, Jr., and James C. Rinaman, Jr., to me known to be the persons described as subscribers in and who executed the foregoing Articles of Incorporation, and they acknowledged before me that they executed and subscribed these Articles of Incorporation.

Witness my hand and official seal in the County and State named above this 8th day of November, 1973.

SHERYL D. SMITH,
Notary Public, State of Florida at Large.

SCHEDULE "A"—COMMISSIONERS

H. S. Albury, Richard A. Altobellis, Karl J. Ambrose, Jr., James H. Arnold, Edward D. Baker, Edward G. Ballance, Wm. U. Bankhead, Chas. H. Barco, Ralph E. Becker, Chas. E. Bennett

Wm. O. Birchfield, Donald M. Bolling, John R. Bond, Richard A. Boone, John W. Bowden, Richard Lee Bowers, Tyrie A. Boyer, Donald L. Braddock, Lewis B. Brantley, Alexander Brest.

Donald Edward Brewer, Jr., Harry E. Brinton, Jacob F. Bryan, III, Kendall G. Bryan, Franklin S. Bunch, Percival E. Campbell, Sr., Smiley Carlton, Frank Carlucci, Joe A. Carlucci, Thos. G. Carpenter, Ph.D., Dale G. Carson, Wm. E. Carter, Geo. Champion, Jr., Wm. V. Chappell, Jr., Harold R. Clark, Jack Coleman, Patricia C. Cowdery, M.D., Alexander M. Crenshaw, John Crider, Joseph L. Cullen.

J. J. Daniel, Henry V. Dartigalongue, Bernard S. Datz, Michael F. Davidson, DeWitt C. Dawkins, Lamar Dean, Miss Kathleen L. Dillonardo, R. Earl Dixon, Wm. B. Doe, Wm. L. Durden.

R. V. Elder, Mrs. Wm. E. Elsberry, Mrs. James S. English, Robert Evans, Julian E. Fant, Jr., Robt. R. Feagin, Ms. Carolyn Fisher, Geo. R. Fisher, John R. Forbes, Joe B. Forshue, Jr.

John A. Futch, Wm. W. Gay, Sidney J. Gefen, Lawrence R. Geis, Harold Gibson, Jim Glisson, Mark A. Gluckman, Jake M. Godbold, Edward L. Green, Geo. R. Grosse.

John T. Gunning, Ed.E., Stephen P. Gyland, M.D., Mattox S. Hair, John A. Hammack, Frank Hampton, Mrs. Constance H. Hansen, David E. Harrell, Wilson L. Harrell, Mrs. E. Ross Harris, Norman J. Harrison, Jr.

Malachi Houghton, III, Lewis A. Hester, Wendell P. Holmes, Jr., Rev. James S. Hornsby, Wm. S. Howell, Homer H. Humphries, Jr., J. Earl Huntley, Donald G. Ingram, Wm. A. Ingram.

Preben Johansen, Earl M. Johnson, Gustave E. Johnson, Ted S. Johnson, Mickey R. King, Frances B. Kinne, Ph. D., Peter Kirill, Ira M. Koger, John F. Lanahan, Rev. Dr. Sidney M. Lefkowitz.

Rt. Rev. Monsignor Lenihan, Geo. M. Linville, James B. Lumpkins, David C. MacNamara, Robt. A. Mallard, Donald T. Martin, Robt. B. Massey, Wm. S. Mathias, Jr., Mrs. Sallye Mathis, Donald R. McClure.

Thos. R. McGehee, Alton E. McLeod, Ms. Linda Menke, Mrs. Gene W. Miller, Wm. Butler Mills, Richard H. Montney, James E. Mooney, Jr., Paul A. Mori, M.D., Henry G. Motes, Jr., Edward A. Mueller.

Sanford A. Mullen, M.D., Harry M. Nearring, Robt. A. Nelson, Virgil R. Norris, Carl Ogden, Robt. W. Olcott, Wm. R. Opp, Willis H. Page, Mrs. Fred S. Patterson, Jr., Wesley C. Paxson.

Rev. Richard A. Petry, Mrs. Geo. E. Pharr, Robt. E. Phillips, Miss Emily L. Price, Wm. P. Pridgen, Jr., John Roger Pugh, Mrs. Irene S. Racine, Mrs. Oscar G. Rawls, Frederick J. Rebman, Frank Reyes.

Alvin Richer, James C. Rinaman, Lynwood Roberts, Rodell F. Roberts, Chas. B. Rogers, III, David E. Russell, John Sanders, Dan I. Scarborough, Robt. W. Schellenberg, Mrs. Christine Schmidt,

Gert H. W. Schmidt, Hugh Schulman, James J. Scott, Jr., Frank W. Sherman, Mary L. Singleton, Frank G. Slaughter, M.D., O. H. Slaughter, Bruce A. Smathers, Mrs. Amella H. Smith, Eric B. Smith.

Harold K. Smith, Frank E. Snell, Jr., Robt. H. Spiro, Ph. D., Wm. J. Staten, Dalton R. Steele, Martin Edward Stein, Malcolm L. Stephens, Jr., Robt. J. Stroh, Mrs. Gray Strum, Richard H. Suddath.

Clarence Suggs, James J. Sugrue, I. M. Sulzbacher, Ms. Eugene M. Suter, Marion E. Sweet, Hans G. Tanzler, Jr., Larry Teague, Gerald Tjoflat, Geo. B. Tobl, Samuel J. Tucker, Ph. D.

Mrs. R. L. Vanderslice, John Van Ness, Wm. Ashley Verlander, Joel D. Wallach, D.V.M., James N. Watson, Charles Webb, Mrs. Fred L. Whitmore, Chester G. Whittaker, Roger K. Wilkinson, Walter L. Williams, Jr.

Gerald Wilson, Hugh Wilson, Nathan H. Wilson, James B. Windham, Louis H. Winward, James H. Winston, Michael J. Wood, Benj. R. Wygal, Ph.D., Claude J. Yates.

DO WITH LESS—OR DO WITHOUT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last night the President again spoke to the Nation on the current energy shortage and outlined in detail some of the steps that should be taken to ease this shortage.

Coincidentally, I read with satisfaction an editorial response in the Harvey Star Tribune of Suburban Cook County, to the President's original message. The editorial, which follows, stresses the significance of the measures that must be taken for the Nation to overcome the current crisis:

DO WITH LESS, OR DO WITHOUT

President Richard Nixon's sobering announcement that the country is faced with a critical energy shortage poses a new challenge for the American people. As citizens of a country blessed, until now at least, with an embarrassment of riches in natural resources, many understandably reacted in pained surprise to the realization that the United States has almost depleted the cupboard and must now begin to do with less or eventually do without.

The President's message was to the point: Not since World War II has the country's need for energy of all types placed such a severe strain on its resources. Indeed, the implication is, unless steps are taken immediately, it undoubtedly will be necessary in the very near future to invoke the logical consequence of the World War II shortages—nationwide rationing.

In order now, as the President indicated, are voluntary economies in lots of little ways all along the line, including such seemingly ordinary things as lower room thermostat settings, elimination of unnecessary lighting around the home and other places, a maximum highway driving speed of 50 miles an hour, and formation of work day car pools.

Some of these measures undoubtedly will prove unpopular with part of the population; fortunately, however, the great majority of Americans will recognize the situation for what it is and do their patriotic best to help the country pull through this latest emergency. This characteristic is another great national resource.

PRESIDENTIAL TELEVISION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial by Don Oakley, published in the November 19, 1973, issue of the Goshen, Ind., News concerning the recent publication, "Presidential Television."

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENTIAL TELEVISION

(By Don Oakley)

A just-published report on a study commissioned by the 20th Century Fund could not be more timely.

At a time when Americans are intensely concerned about the health of our governmental system of checks and balances, the report charges that "the president's overwhelming access to prime-time radio and TV, unmatched by any other branch of government," has fundamentally altered that system.

The report, entitled "Presidential Television," has been brought out in book form by Basic Books. One of its authors is former Federal Communications Commission chairman Newton N. Minow, the colner of that immortal description of television as a "vast wasteland."

Maybe it is for the viewing public. But for the past four presidents, television has been a land of golden opportunity. Via the electronic medium, the report contends, the chief executive has been able to outmaneuver, out-convince and out-headline the other branches of government as well as the opposition party.

In Minow's view President Nixon is probably the most innovative and adept user of presidential television.

He has commanded and received more free time than any predecessors. During his first 40 months in office prior to his Moscow trip in 1972, Mr. Nixon made 32 special appearances in prime time, compared to only 24 by President Johnson in more than five years, 10 by President Kennedy in under three years and 23 by President Eisenhower in eight years.

The president's ability to choose when and how to appear—without cost—before the American public is completely unmatched by his political or congressional opponents, says Minow.

"It means," he writes, "holding a press conference before a potential audience of 60 million people . . . It is the carefully presented presidential 'image.' It is the nationally viewed justification of war, invocation of peace, praise for political allies, damnation of opponents, veto of legislation, scolding of Congress . . ."

"The president may make a formal address, hold a press conference, consent to an interview, telephone an astronaut, go to a football game, receive a visiting chief of state, take a trip abroad or play with his dog on the White House lawn. He may send his family, his cabinet members or his political allies before the cameras. In almost every case, he, and he alone, decides."

The report makes a number of suggestions to correct this imbalance. Among them:

Televised debates from the floor of the House and Senate; live debates between spokesmen for the two major parties four times a year; guaranteed air time for the opposition to reply to any presidential address broadcast in the months preceding a national election; improved coverage of Supreme Court decisions.

Also, by way of countering the influence of big money in presidential campaigns, the report proposes allotting each candidate certain amounts of network time, to be paid for by the government at half price.

It is a good thing and in the public interest for a president to speak to the nation frequently, says Minow. But it is also important that the political opposition and the other branches of government have equal opportunity to influence public opinion.

And that is today's "hysterical" comment.

PRECEDENT INVOLVING PRESIDENT THOMAS JEFFERSON

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon in two televised press conferences, cited a precedent involving President Thomas Jefferson as his principal defense for not turning over the Watergate tapes to the court.

Although the President has since agreed to release these tapes, he still continues to use this example as a reason why he does not have to do so.

The fact is that President Jefferson made every effort to comply with the court order.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a study done by the Library of Congress which presents the facts in this case.

The study follows:

DOCUMENTS FORWARDED BY PRESIDENT THOMAS JEFFERSON TO THE TRIALS OF AARON BURR IN 1807

(By Stephen Stathis)

The trial of former Vice President Aaron Burr on charges of treason against the United States had entered its third week when Mr. Burr stunned the courtroom with an announcement that he desired the court "to issue a subpoena to the President of the United States, with a clause, requiring him to produce certain papers; or in other words to issue the subpoena duces tecum." It was Mr. Burr's intent to secure as evidence in his defense a letter dated October 21, 1806 which had been sent to President Jefferson by General James Wilkinson, as well as documents containing instructions for the army and navy "to destroy" Burr's "person and property." Burr added that if the Attorney for the United States (George Hay) would produce the documents requested, he would withdraw his motion for the issuance of a subpoena. In his affidavit of the following day Burr summarized his rationale for the subpoena duces tecum.

Upon the introduction of Burr's motion, an immediate controversy arose over the right of the court to subpoena the President of the United States. Chief Justice John Marshall, the presiding judge in the trial, called for argument because "I [Chief Justice Marshall] am not prepared to give an opinion on this point." For the next four days the propriety of the question was debated. The prosecution admitted that the court might issue a subpoena to the President as well as any other man, but maintained that he was not bound to disclose confidential communications.

On June 13, 1807 Chief Justice Marshall delivered his opinion on the motion proposed by Mr. Burr. Marshall held that the Presi-

Footnotes at end of article.

dent was subject to subpoena just like any other citizen, that there was nothing in the Constitution that exempts a President from a subpoena. However, Marshall stated that: "if, upon any principle, the President could be construed to stand exempt from the general provisions of the Constitution, it would be, because his duties, as chief magistrate, demand his whole time for national objectives."⁵ If the President's duties did require his full time, he could submit the papers instead of appearing before the Court.⁶

President Jefferson previously had been informed of Burr's request in one of John Hay's regular letters.⁷ On June 12, 1807, the day prior to the issuance of Marshall's opinion, Jefferson wrote Hay that all the papers relevant to the Burr case had been hand-carried to Richmond by Attorney General Caesar A. Rodney. As to the Wilkinson letter, Jefferson explained that he did not recollect the entire contents of the letter and requested Hay to exercise his own discretion in "withholding the communication of any part of the letter [Wilkinson's] which are not directly material for the purpose of justice."⁸ With regard to the copies of military correspondence requested by Burr, Jefferson indicated that only those papers which were "proper for communication and pertinent to any point" would be forwarded to Mr. Hay. Two letters apparently within the context of the definition of relevance as applied by the President were forwarded to Hay by the Secretary of War on the same day.⁹

On the 17th of June the President personally forwarded additional papers to Hay. Jefferson felt that these documents substantially fulfilled the objective of the subpoena. If, however, questions should still exist, the President stated that he and the Heads of the Departments would be willing to submit a deposition, "through any persons whom the Court shall authorize to take our testimony at this place [Washington]."

Jefferson continued by arguing that this was the suitable alternative to a personal appearance at the trial. Such an appearance Jefferson explained would set a precedent that might expose him to subpoenas to attend other trials as far away as the Mississippi Territory.

"To comply with such calls would leave the nation without an executive branch, whose agency, never the less, is understood to be so constantly necessary, that it is the sole branch which the Constitution requires to be always in function. It could not mean that it should be withdrawn from its station by any co-ordinate activity."¹⁰

Again, on June 20th¹¹ and later on the 7th of September,¹² Jefferson repeated, to Hay, his strong convictions regarding the separation of powers under the Constitution. In the second letter Jefferson stated:

"As I do not believe that the district courts have a power of commanding the executive government to abandon superior duties and attend on them, at whatever distance, I am unwilling, by any notice of the subpoena, to set a precedent which might sanction a proceeding so preposterous. I enclose you, therefore, a letter, public and for the court, covering substantially all they ought to desire. If the papers which were enclosed in Wilkinson's letter may, in your judgment, be communicated without injury, you will be pleased to communicate them. I return you the original letter."¹³

Stemming from Jefferson's declarations on executive privilege a question began to emerge which ultimately has become the focal point of discussion among historians and constitutional scholars today. Although numerous long and weighty expositions have attempted to trace the degree of compliance exhibited by President Jefferson to the subpoena for the Wilkinson letter of October 21, 1806, a wide range of opinion still exists. Yet extensive research has disclosed a number of

apparently incontrovertible facts. The original copy of the subpoenaed October 21, 1806 letter from General Wilkinson to President Jefferson was never found, as Jefferson explained in his letters of the 17th, 21st and 23rd of June to Hay and Wilkinson.¹⁴ An authenticated and complete copy of this letter, however, was presented as evidence before the Grand Jury prior to Burr's treason trial¹⁵ and later during his subsequent misdemeanor trial.¹⁶

Apparently, confusion has arisen over the Wilkinson letter because of the incomplete condition of the records of Burr's trials,¹⁷ and the fact that on September 4, 1807 (during the misdemeanor trial) Burr requested a second letter from Wilkinson to Jefferson dated November 12, 1806.¹⁸ Although this second letter was not specifically requested by Burr in his original motion, his right to make such a request was not questioned. Hay, however, did explain that President Jefferson had devolved upon him the authority, which constitutionally belonged to the President, to withhold those portions of correspondence not relevant to the case now being tried. The accuracy of his judgment in this regard, Hay explained, he was "willing to refer to the judgment of the court, by submitting the original letter [of November 12, 1806] to its inspection."¹⁹

Burr's attorneys argued that the President's power of discretion could not be passed on to Hay.²⁰ Chief Justice Marshall subsequently upheld the contention of the defense by declaring that "In this case . . . the president had assigned no reason whatever for withholding the paper called for. The propriety of withholding it must be decided by himself, not by another for him."²¹ Thereupon "Hay stated that there was one passage in General Wilkinson's letter [of November 12, 1806] which he was certain the President himself would hold back."²² As a result he would not turn over that letter to the defendant, but "would immediately send an express to Monticello for instructions . . ."²³

On September 9, 1807 Hay reported the response of President Jefferson. After reading the correspondence from the President,²⁴ "Hay observed, that in his own and in the President's extracted copy from Gen. Wilkinson's letter [of November 12, 1806] there was not a variation of more than ten or fifteen words; the omitted passages were, indeed, so manifestly improper to be submitted to the court."²⁵

Three times thereafter (during the misdemeanor trial) the Wilkinson letter of November 12, 1806 was discussed. On September 16, 1807 Burr again stated his dissatisfaction with the abbreviated version of the letter of the preceding November that was submitted to the court;²⁶ and on September 29, 1807 defense attorney Wickham in his cross-examination of General Wilkinson asked if Wilkinson could turn over a complete copy of that letter to court. Hay at that point protested, citing the President's correspondence. Chief Justice Marshall apparently then closed the issue. Marshall "remarked that after the president had been consulted, he could not think of requiring from General Wilkinson the exhibition of those parts of the letter [of November 12] which the president was unwilling to disclose."²⁷ By the first of October when the contents of the November letter were again discussed the disclosure of the complete letter had apparently ceased to be an issue.²⁸

Unwilling to attend the trial yet cooperative to a large degree, the President had exercised his allowable option under Marshall's opinion. Although Jefferson believed that it was "the necessary right of the President of the U.S. to decide, independently of all other authority, what papers coming to him as President, the public interest permits to be communicated and to whom,"²⁹ he apparently made available a majority of the

records sought by the Court. Unfortunately, a complete list of the documents forwarded apparently does not exist. And a record of the parts of Wilkinson's letter of Nov. 12, 1806 which were withheld by Hay and (later) by Jefferson likewise is unavailable.

FOOTNOTES

¹ David Robertson, Reports of the trials of Colonel Aaron Burr for treason, and for a misdemeanor. Vol. I Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Published by Hopkins and Earle, Fry and Kammer, Printers [1808] pp. 113-114.

² *Ibid.*, p. 114.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 182. See also Thomas Perkins Abernethy, The Burr conspiracy. Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith [1968] p. 238; and Robert K. Faulkner, John Marshall and the Burr trial. The Journal of American history, v. 53, No. 2, September 1966: 257.

⁷ John Hay to Thomas Jefferson, June 9, 1807, Thomas Jefferson Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.

⁸ Thomas Jefferson to John Hay, June 12, 1807, Paul Leicester Ford, ed. The writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. IX, 1807-1815. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons [1898] p. 55.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 55-56.

¹⁰ Thomas Jefferson to John Hay, June 17, 1807, P. L. Ford. The writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. IX, p. 57.

¹¹ Thomas Jefferson to John Hay, June 20, 1807, P. L. Ford. The writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. IX, p. 60.

¹² Thomas Jefferson to John Hay, September 7, 1807, P. L. Ford. The writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. IX, p. 63.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Thomas Jefferson to John Hay, June 17, 1807, and June 23, P. L. Ford. The writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. IX, pp. 56, 61; and Thomas Jefferson to General James Wilkinson, June 21, 1807, H. A. Washington, ed. The writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. V Washington, Published by Taylor and Maury [1853] p. 109.

¹⁵ General Wilkinson testified on September 29, 1807 that a copy of his October 21, 1806 letter to President Jefferson had been given to the Grand Jury. For the text of that disclosure see: T. Carpenter, The Trial of Col. Aaron Burr on an indictment for treason before the Circuit Court of the United States, held in Richmond, (Virginia) May term 1807: including the arguments and decisions on all motions and trial, and on the motions for an attachment against Gen. Wilkinson. Vol. III. Washington City, Printed by Westcott and Co. [1808] p. 254.

¹⁶ For the details on how the October 21, 1806 letter from General Wilkinson to President Jefferson became a part of the record of misdemeanor trial see: T. Carpenter, The Trial of Col. Aaron Burr, Vol. III, pp. 38-46. For a complete copy of the letter see: James Wilkinson to Thomas Jefferson, October 21, 1806, U.S. Department of State: Letters in Relation to Burr's conspiracy 1806-1808, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.

¹⁷ David Robertson's Reports of the trials of Aaron Burr is most frequently cited as documentation for discussions on the Burr trials; however neither Robertson's work nor the records of the Burr trial held by the Virginia State Library in Richmond accurately describe events after September 9, 1807. Only the out-of-print three-volume work by T. Carpenter, The Trial of Aaron Burr, details the events of Burr's misdemeanor trial into October of 1807.

¹⁸ D. Robertson, Reports of the trials of Aaron Burr, Vol. II, p. 504.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 514.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 512.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 536.

²² T. Carpenter, The trial of Col. Aaron Burr, Vol. III, p. 38.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Thomas Jefferson to John Hay, September 7, 1807, P. L. Ford. The writings of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. IX, pp. 63-64.

²⁵ T. Carpenter. The trial of Col. Aaron Burr. Vol. III, p. 46.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 111-112.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 254.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 265-266.

²⁹ Thomas Jefferson to John Hay, June 7, 1807, P. L. Ford. The writings of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. IX, p. 55.

THE ADVENTURES OF RANGER FORD

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Congress is now investigating the background of our colleague, the Honorable JERRY FORD, prior to voting on whether to confirm his nomination as Vice President. An interesting sidelight of JERRY's past—his service as a seasonal ranger at Yellowstone National Park—has been kindly brought to my attention by National Park Service Director Ron Walker.

The latest edition of the NPS newsletter contains a fascinating account of JERRY's activities riding shotgun on a bear-feeding truck, his courtly service dancing with unescorted young ladies, and above all, his coolness under stress. Here, for the enjoyment and information of our colleagues, is the newsletter story on the "Adventures of Ranger Ford":

VICE-PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE—JERRY FORD—"A DARNED GOOD RANGER"

(By Jean Bullard)

Gerald R. Ford will be the first National Park Service seasonal ranger to become Vice President of the United States if his nomination is confirmed. His name has become familiar to most Americans recently, but few of us in the Park Service realize that Jerry Ford was a seasonal ranger at Yellowstone the summer of 1936.

"One of the greatest summers of my life," Jerry Ford responded enthusiastically to a query from the Newsletter about his summer as a ranger.

This answer was delivered by his wife, Mrs. Betty Ford, who invited me with a warm welcome to the Ford's home in Alexandria, Virginia. She said that the Yellowstone summer was one often mentioned in the Ford family.

Among the favorite bedtime stories of the four Ford children, Mrs. Ford explained, was the one their father used to tell about his adventures as a ranger feeding the bears at Yellowstone.

"Of course we realize that rangers feeding the bears at Yellowstone is a thing of the past," Mrs. Ford quickly explained.

At that moment her tall blond son, Steve, 17, a senior at local T. C. Williams High School, entered the living room. Mrs. Ford asked him, "Steve, do you remember your father's Yellowstone stories?"

"You mean the bear tales?" said Steve with a smile. "I sure do."

Mrs. Ford mentioned that the influence of the west and the parks has been evident in the whole family. She said that the Ford's second son, Jack, 21, a forestry student at Utah State University, spent last summer working in Utah for the U.S. Forest Service

in a position similar to his father's Park Service job.

Mrs. Ford generously lent the Newsletter their only photo of Jerry Ford in his NPS ranger uniform. The other photo of the Canyon District rangers and ranger naturalists (see page 7) was obtained from Frank Anderson through the persistent efforts to locate him by Elsie Doherty, park technician, PNRO.

The Newsletter contacted several men in the photo to learn more about that summer in Yellowstone.

"Jerry was a darned good ranger," said his former supervisor, Canyon District Ranger Frank Anderson, now retired. "I had a letter from Jerry just last August mentioning his fine memories of that summer we shared in Yellowstone."

Among the duties Frank assigned to Jerry was the task of armed guard on the bear-feeding truck. Every evening visitors were fenced-in in an area with benches while grizzly and black bears roamed free when they appeared about 7:30 p.m.

The ranger truck would drive into the garbage pit to feed the bears while Jerry rode in the back with a gun in case there was any trouble. He never did have to fire a shot but there were some close calls.

Another ranger duty was meeting the VIPs at Canyon Hotel and Lodge, a job that called for someone who could meet people well and who had a very neat appearance in uniform. "When I asked Jerry to do the job," Frank explained, "he said he felt it was undemocratic and un-American to give special attention to VIPs, but he did the job and did it well."

Everyone contacted mentioned the evenings they used to hold wrestling matches among themselves and with some of the road crew in the community room of the ranger station. One night the conversation turned to football and Wayne Repogle suggested that Jerry Ford demonstrate a straight-on tackle.

Ford gave an energetic try and both he and Wayne went right through the thin masonry wall into the next room. There followed a great scramble to repair the damages before arrival of the chief ranger.

Wayne Repogle, senior seasonal of the group, roomed with Jerry Ford in the ranger station and frequently shared duties with him.

"I never saw Jerry show any excitement or emotion during a difficult rescue or at other times of stress," said Wayne.

"He would always say, 'Calm down everybody. It'll turn out all right.' He was always so reliable that we looked to him to get difficult assignments done right, even though he was one of our youngest rangers that summer."

"In those days," continued Wayne, "rangers were on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week. You could not get out of uniform without permission from your district ranger who in turn had to clear it by phoning the chief ranger at Mammoth."

"Even to go on a picnic you had to ask for permission and then tell where you were going, who with and when you would return. Jerry was handsome and young, maybe 24, and with the girls he was the most popular of us bachelors that summer."

"He was frequently chosen for dance duty. This meant spending the evening at the lodge or the hotel in uniform all cleaned and pressed with riding boots polished with a clean white dress shirt and green tie. Daytime shirts were grey wool."

"Visitors really flocked around and would often ask pointless questions just as an excuse to say that they had talked with a ranger."

One duty Jerry liked was the early morning check, about 5 to 7 a.m., of every auto in camp. Rangers recorded the make, state and license number of each vehicle and type of tent. Wayne said, "We had to run most of

the time to get 150 to 200 licenses listed in two hours."

"Jerry, a football player, was in good shape and enjoyed this early duty. In fact he was fine company because he genuinely enjoyed just about everything we rangers had to do," Wayne concluded.

MEDICAL EMERGENCIES IN THE SNOW

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the combination of heavy snow and a medical emergency can be a serious problem indeed. A problem that all levels of government, the medical profession, and countless volunteer and professional agencies dealing with health have been trying to solve for years.

In Syracuse, N.Y., my hometown, a detailed plan has been worked out and will get its first serious test this winter. A recent article in the American Medical News detailed this plan and I would like to share that article with my colleagues:

MEDICAL EMERGENCIES IN THE SNOW

Every winter, a cold wind sweeps across Lake Ontario and dumps an average of 135 inches of snow on the unlucky residents of Syracuse, N.Y., and surrounding communities.

And that's a serious medical problem. Emergency treatment systems that run smoothly under normal conditions simply won't function in a snowstorm—an almost weekly occurrence in Syracuse. Ambulances won't run. Power goes out. Phone lines go down. People get stalled, stuck and lost.

But thanks to the Onondaga County Medical Society, the 415,000 citizens of that county will be getting medical care when they need it this winter, snow or no snow.

Using automobiles, sled ambulances, snowplows, two-way radios, and hundreds of volunteers, the society's "snow emergency medical program" can dispatch physicians and nurses to isolated places to aid the ill and injured and provide other health services—even during blizzards.

It's a cooperative effort, involving about 80 physicians, 225 nurses, 54 fire departments, four ambulance services and scores of firemen, municipal crews, and rescue units—all unpaid volunteers, working on their own time.

In fact, one of the project's interesting features is that it won't cost the taxpayer a cent, since all services and equipment are donated, and the medical society pays for the medications and supplies used by the physicians and nurses.

The entire project, under the direction of Edward D. Sugarman, M.D., a Syracuse orthopedic surgeon, was started and organized by the county medical society. It's a remarkable demonstration of close cooperation between individuals and a large number of public and private agencies.

Dr. Sugarman said the program has actually been operating for two years, though this winter the system has been expanded to operate county-wide. It was ready to go last winter, but Onondaga County was fortunate in having an unusually mild winter.

However, "test runs" conducted in previous winters prove that volunteer systems work, as when a sudden blizzard isolated a small town 30 miles south of Syracuse two years ago. The emergency units quickly reached the town, established communica-

tions with outlying areas, and set up overnight aid facilities.

The goal of the program is to insure that emergency services are available when heavy snowfall brings normal emergency systems to a grinding halt. For example, when illness or injury strikes a snowbound farm, participants work together to find out about it and dispatch a nurse or physician—aboard a snowmobile, if necessary—to bring help.

THE RED CHINESE SPEND MILLIONS ON PROLETARIAT HOUSING IN WASHINGTON

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the most recent and tangible evidence of expanded United States-Red China relations is the multimillion-dollar purchase of a large Washington hotel to house Peking's growing diplomatic mission to the United States.

The 50 people of the Chinese delegation have apparently outgrown their old quarters at the Mayflower Hotel. China-watchers view this move to the 400-room Windsor Park Hotel as a major step toward full-scale diplomatic relations. The staggering sale price, reported at between \$5 and \$6 million, makes it evident that the Red Chinese plan to make their mission more than just unofficial.

Connecticut Avenue, in the exclusive Northwest section of Washington, is a far cry from the "proletariat housing" found in other areas of the Nation's Capital. Apparently, "the people's representatives" have been influenced to some degree in their taste for housing by the "running dogs of capitalism."

I include the related newsclipping at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 18, 1973]

CHINESE BUY WINDSOR PARK HOTEL

(By Judy Luce Mann)

The People's Republic of China has signed a contract to purchase the 400-room Windsor Park Hotel for use as a chancery and residence for its expanding liaison staff.

The purchase price could not be ascertained, but an industry source who was asked to act as a real estate broker for the hotel earlier this year put the price at between \$5 million and \$6 million.

The purchase comes in the wake of an announcement on Nov. 14 that the United States and China have agreed to expand and upgrade their liaison staffs in Peking and Washington. The move was viewed by observers as a major step toward full diplomatic recognition and the establishment of embassies between the two countries.

The Chinese delegation in Washington, about 50 people, has been using space at the Mayflower Hotel. The delegation has been looking for permanent facilities since last April.

Hampton Davis, a State Department protocol officer, said members of the delegation looked at the Windsor "quite early. They've been considering this one for six months or so." Real estate agents were invited to submit facilities for consideration and the State Department also gave some suggestions as to properties, Davis said.

"They wanted to have a place where they could combine offices and residence for people. They were hoping to have some space around this for a garden. This necessarily represents some compromise," Davis said.

The hotel, at 2300 and 2310 Connecticut Ave. NW, has about 400 rooms, a Korean restaurant, newstands, a gift shop and reception rooms. It does not have space for large formal gardens.

Wallace B. Agnew, a real estate broker in the District, who was asked to sell the hotel earlier this year, said yesterday the Chinese paid "a lot more for it than it's worth because they needed a place badly. They had to buy something they could move into that was already furnished. It would be hard to find all that many rooms ready to go, with linen service and telephones in all the rooms." He estimated the sale price at between \$5 million and \$6 million and said a sale price of \$4 million would be "pretty high."

The hotel is owned by Bernard Bralove and Stafford Fletcher, who also manages it. Bralove refused to disclose the purchase price. "I'm not going to give you any idea of the price. I don't think it's anybody's business," he said. Settlement on the contract has not been made, so it does not show up on public records.

Bralove said that none of the current occupants of the hotel hold leases but he would not disclose how soon they would be moving out and the Chinese delegation members moving in, saying such information should be disclosed by the Chinese.

Members of the delegation could not be reached for comment. However, a State Department official said he understood that some members of the delegation are scheduled to move in this week.

Attorneys for the Chinese asked the District board of zoning adjustment Wednesday for a special exception to establish a chancery and residential facility at the hotel. The board granted a similar exception on Sept. 19 for use of a limited portion, the "executive wing," of the hotel as a chancery.

At that time, only one person questioned the request, wanting to know if the property would be kept up.

The brief filed with the board Wednesday states that "upon further investigation and examination" of the site, "the liaison office has determined that the purchase of 2300 Connecticut Ave. . . . permit larger accommodations for residential uses and a larger area for chancery uses."

The brief also states that the "major portion of both premises will continue in residential uses, serving the chancery staff, supporting personnel and their families." The board is scheduled to act on the request Tuesday.

KINDERGARTEN CLASSES ARE RESCHEDULED TO SAVE GASOLINE

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the information of my colleagues the action of Kentucky's Montgomery County School Board in adapting the school program to meet the exigencies imposed by the petroleum shortage, as outlined in the Lexington Herald of November 22, 1973.

While our people are concerned about the disruptive effects of the possible imposition of national daylight saving time, I deem the action of the Montgomery

County Board of Education a refreshing reminder of our people's ability to adjust to the needs of the times.

KINDERGARTEN DAYS REVISED TO SAVE GAS

Mr. STERLING, Ky.—Classes of the kindergarten of the Montgomery County school system will be rescheduled after the first of the year to save gasoline.

The Board of Education at a special meeting voted to hold classes for half of the children during regular school hours on Monday and Tuesday and half a day Wednesday, and the other half Wednesday afternoon and all day Thursday and Friday beginning Jan. 7. At present half of the pupils are attending in the morning and the other half in the afternoon.

Board members also agreed that gasoline for school trips be purchased at nearby service stations in order not to use the school's allotment.

In the event the nation goes back to Daylight Saving Time the schools will open an hour later, at 9 a.m., and close at 4 p.m.

The board voted to purchase four new 66-passenger buses with automatic transmissions and awarded the Bailey Nursery, Mt. Sterling a \$1,355.75 contract for landscaping at the new junior high school.

SOUTHERN BAPTIST FELLOWSHIP BREAKFAST

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on October 30, 1973, the Members of Congress were invited to a breakfast in the Members private dining room to share fellowship with some distinguished visitors. The visitors included: Owen Cooper, president, Southern Baptist Convention; Cecil E. Sherman, pastor, First Baptist Church, Asheville, N.C.; and C. Welton Gaddy, director of Christian Citizenship Development, the Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention.

The visitors at the Southern Baptist fellowship breakfast spoke on the subject "Focus on Intergity." I would like to share their remarks with you, other Members of Congress, and the general public because they can be an inspiration to each of us.

The remarks follow:

INTEGRITY: CHALLENGE TO A NEW COMMITMENT

As you well know, no one Southern Baptist can, or would even attempt, to speak for any other Southern Baptist much less the Convention as a whole. However, out of my involvement in the structures of this denomination and as a result of the many personal acquaintances which I have made, there are some things which I have come to know about Southern Baptists and thus some things about which I feel comfortable to speak.

In relation to government, the history of Southern Baptists is one marked by unflinching patriotism, sincere prayerful support, and individual political involvement. Members of this denomination have effectively served in the highly esteemed offices of the federal government, even as you are now serving, as well as in the state capitols and county court houses across our land. At present, my home state of Mississippi is governed by a dedicated Christian who is a faithful Southern Baptist church member.

Southern Baptists are deeply concerned with biblical morality and we desire to see this morality embodied in those who lead our nation. The support of the people in the 33,000 churches of our Convention will almost invariably be behind those politicians whose words resonate with honesty and whose lives exhibit integrity. As you know, we are a people who quickly grow impatient with anyone who attempts to use the processes of government for personal gain, deceive the voters, or violate the basic personal rights and liberties given to us by Almighty God and guaranteed for us by the Constitution.

None of this is new. None of this is partisan. The disturbing events of recent weeks have provoked outcries of dismay because of their obviously illegal and unethical nature. Southern Baptists join in a plea for recommitment to the basic moral principles upon which our government has traditionally stood. This plea grows out of time-tested convictions which antedate Watergate or any other contemporary event.

We have come here today with at least a partial understanding of the present dilemma of persons like yourselves who seek to serve the nation in government. Because of the recent tragic events, public distrust of governmental leadership and cynicism regarding the political process have increased. These matters are disturbing to us even as they are to you. We still believe in this government's ability to function effectively and justly. We want to encourage the citizens who attend our churches to not withdraw but to involve themselves even more integrally in the political process. You, who serve here day in and day out, can count on our prayerful support, especially in times of crisis but at other times as well.

We believe that whatever measure of greatness America has achieved is in no small way related to dynamic moral leadership and an abiding national commitment to such matters as integrity, personal liberty, justice, and equality. Persons like yourselves help us be assured of the continuation of that leadership and commitment. We take pride in knowing that there are so many Southern Baptist Senators and Congressmen as well as other outstanding Christian leaders serving in the United States government.

Let me thank you for being here this morning in order that we might share in a time of Christian fellowship and join together in praying for our nation and each other. At the same time, let me encourage you to keep open the lines of communication between yourselves and the spiritual leadership of our Convention. We will seek to be more faithful at this point ourselves. My prayer is that we may all so carry out our responsibilities in relation to government that God may be glorified in our nation, strengthened as a guarantor of liberty and justice for all. Count on us to be praying for you and call on us if there are other ways in which we can be of help.

INTEGRITY: SPIRITUAL DIMENSIONS

(By Cecil E. Sherman)

My friends, I have waited for this day for all of a lifetime. Finally, the tables are turned. You see, I have listened to Senator Tom Connally address the students of Baylor University. I stood in a Texas "northern" to hear Senator Lyndon B. Johnson speak at the State Fair of Texas. I've heard Congressman Roy Taylor numerous times as he goes about his district in Western North Carolina. But at no time have I ever had a "captive audience" of congressmen and senators listening to me. I don't intend to misuse the moment.

I have pondered long about the words I have chosen. The crisis in confidence that surrounds government has such an obvious spiritual dimension. I am a preacher. Sin,

truth, deceit, and integrity: these words are the stuff of my profession. Rather than give you a preachment, I think I shall tell you a personal story.

While I was a seminary student in Fort Worth, Texas, I was also the pastor of a very small open-country church in Fannin County, Texas. Some of you may recall that Fannin County was the home of Sam Rayburn. I would drive back and forth from Fort Worth to that open-country church each weekend. The round trip was 300 miles. I did this for four years: 1950 until 1954. I lived in the homes of the farmers. I came to know those people like no other people I have ever pastored. Most of them were trying to stretch the family farm through one more generation. Some were still plowing with mules. Fun was Saturday afternoon in town buying groceries and going to a "shoot-em-up" movie. Saturday night was spent listening to Grand Ole Opry and playing dominoes. I was not reared on the farm, but I came to love those people and their simple kind of life. Religion was big with them. Most of them "got religion" during the summer revivals, and they knew that they were supposed to live with their wife, care for their children, tell the truth, work for their living, and love their country. It was a pretty simple and straight-forward way of living. On the last Sunday in August of 1954 I left those people. I was going to graduate school at Princeton Theological Seminary in Princeton, New Jersey. I was also to be the chaplain to the Baptist students of Princeton University.

I cannot imagine a more severe and total change in congregations. From farmers in a backwater of Northeast Texas to the urbane and very sophisticated students of an old Ivy League university. I had never been to Princeton. I was afraid and unsure of myself. Surely among all of these very intelligent people I must change my message, I reasoned. And for awhile I did bend. But slowly this truth dawned upon me: the students at Princeton were remarkably like the people in my country church. Farmers are tempted to cheat. Students are tempted to cheat. Farmers have ways they avoid social responsibility. Students can retreat from the hard parts of "loving your brother." People are people and being a Christian is just being a Christian wherever you are.

Some of your people probably came from simple homes and godly people. Somebody has trusted you; that is how you got elected. Now you live in the fast swirl of Washington. The ways to be dishonest are more subtle. The penalties for wrongdoing are not precise. The example of some in high places is not helpful. What is a politician who wants to be honest to do?

I think the answer does not lie in new theories about ethics. Our wisdom comes from the Bible. We are to love God. We are to place our loyalty to him above all other loyalties. We are to live simply, for the clutter of many things will corrupt us. We are to tell the truth. We are to honor our families. We are to live temperate lives. We are to love our neighbors as we love ourselves. We are to "bear one another's burdens." These are the great ideas of any ethic. These are the moral principles which all Americans need to see and a large majority of Americans want to see embodied in their governmental leaders. These great ideas, so frequently acclaimed, must be as frequently practiced. Seldom has there been a more opportune time for Christian statesmen to assert strong moral and spiritual leadership in accord with these principles than the present.

Coming to Washington does not change anything. It does not alter moral demands, though it could increase our tolerance for something less than the ethic of which I have just spoken. When I went from the country to Princeton, I found that really nothing had changed. I hope that you people who have come from the heartland to Washington and

that the rest of us who are still trying to be responsible Christian citizens out at the grassroots are being controlled by those great Bible ideas that we learned from our homes and churches when we were children. If we are, I can hope again for my country.

PRAYER FOR INTEGRITY

(By C. Welton Gaddy)

Our Father, we are in trouble. We humbly seek your help. We pray that integrity may be established as the characteristic of our words, the mark of our behavior, indeed as the life-style of our nation.

We pray for our nation—that the erosion of credibility between citizens and governmental officials may be arrested before the gap becomes a canyon;

that the leaders of our country may, by both words and deeds, reestablish the importance of honesty in national affairs and in personal matters;

that the laws of the land and the institutions which implement their intent may be spared manipulation for personal gain and utilized for justice and the public good; that the trust of our republic may not be limited to that power which is measured in megatons or to that wealth which is reflected in the Gross National Product but that it may rest in You;

that our commitment to honesty, our pursuit of justice, or elimination of discrimination, our support of freedom, our efforts at world peace, may be of such a nature as to assure us a place of moral leadership in the international community.

We pray for the citizens of our nation.

Lord, our trust has been ruptured by double talk and immoral behavior on the part of persons within high echelons of government.

Our minds are troubled by a tumult of crises.

Our wills are frustrated as we vacillate between a sense of importance as citizens and a sense of futility.

We are in desperate need of your help.

Forgive our worship of a civil religion which equates nationalism with Christianity, confuses governmental policy with your will, and interprets patriotism as blind allegiance.

Disturb any apathy concerning the political arena until complacency becomes creative involvement in politics on behalf of basic morality.

Translate our political cynicism into a responsible citizenship which persistently works at every level of government, supporting that which is right and challenging that which is wrong.

We pray for the leaders who have gathered in this room—

that they may ever be cognizant of your support even as of your expectations for them;

that they may be among those in this 93rd Congress who by moral leadership secure once again the shaking foundations of this democracy.

May their faith be a source of courage and their communion with you a source of strength.

Now keep us disciplined in our fellowship of the One who was the incarnation of integrity, the One who thus can make us free. Amen.

WISDOM FROM YOUTH

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I include the following: Part of a letter from Tracy Taverner, Student Energy Crisis

Day Committee Chairman, Sooner High School, Bartlesville, Okla.

DEAR MR. McSPADEN: The students of Sooner High School in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, have become deeply concerned with the increasing lack of energy facing our nation today. Because of this concern, we, the Sooner student body, have decided to set aside Thursday, November 29, 1973, as "Energy Crisis Day."

Our goal is to make ourselves and others more aware of the national problem of the lack of energy and how we, as high school students, can help our country to conserve the nation's natural energy and to convince other high school students to do the same.

To accomplish this purpose, we have planned and organized a student body march, to be led by the Sooner Spartan band, from a local church to school, the purpose being to conserve the gasoline used daily by Sooner students in their travels to and from school. Lights, heat, and most electrical appliances will be shut off at Sooner during the day.

Sooner students are issuing a challenge to every high school in the nation to take up the crusade to encourage the youth of today to conserve our natural resources. Although we realize that the energy saved on this day by our students will not make a significant difference in the energy crisis, it is our hope that through these efforts we will inspire other schools to follow the example in conserving energy so vital in our nation's existence. We feel "it's better to light one candle than to curse the darkness."

Yours sincerely,

TRACY TAVERNER,
Student Energy Crisis Committee Chairman.

PRESENT LAWS DISCOURAGE ENERGY SAVINGS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the realization that the energy sources upon which we depend may well be either depleted or unavailable sometime in the future has encouraged many of us to begin to look more closely and with more enthusiasm as the vast possibilities of solar energy.

While science and industry press on to find cures for the energy crisis, we should examine our present laws to see if they inadvertently discourage energy savings. One such area is title II of the National Housing Act under the Federal Housing Administration.

As the law now reads, the ceiling on mortgages dissuades homebuyers from installing energy conserving devices because of their higher initial cost. In the case of a single family dwelling, the maximum FHA insurance is \$33,000. Presented with either a short term capital savings or a lower fuel bill in the future, the average consumer will take the former to keep near the \$33,000 limit.

The long-term effect of the limited ceiling discourages sales of solar energy devices, and also discourages research into what companies see as a deadend market. With fuel costs certain to rise, and in the interests of reaching self-sufficiency in energy, it is time to encourage the regrowth of the solar energy business

by granting dollar for dollar rises in the FHA ceilings for solar energy devices approved under the provisions of my bill.

It is obvious that there is enough solar energy to meet our demands. Even if our demand were increased to the ultimate saturation level estimated at 45 kW per person, which is 22 times the present level, and even if our population grew to 500 million persons, only 0.3 percent of the solar energy coming in contact with our land would be needed to fill the resulting enormous demand.

Some 2 trillion kilowatt hours—kWh—of electrical energy were used in the United States in 1970. Incident solar energy in our deserts averages some 2,000 kWh per year per square meter. Simply put, our electrical energy consumption was equivalent to the solar radiation falling on only some 400 square miles of desert.

The Solar Energy Panel in the White House has identified three broad applications of solar energy. These are: First the heating and cooling of homes and commercial buildings, second, the chemical and biological conversion of organic materials to liquid, solid, and gaseous fuels, and, third, the generation of electricity.

Some 15 percent of our present energy consumption, electric and otherwise, are used today for space heating and cooling. This percentage represents a larger share than our total electrical power generated today.

Rising fuel costs are beginning to make solar energy feasible for space heating. Already it is less expensive than electric heating in many areas, such as New Mexico and Arizona, and even Miami. Office buildings are especially suited for solar heating and air-conditioning, because they are used most heavily during daylight hours.

There are even a few companies which manufacture solar water heaters in the United States. Before natural gas became widely available in Florida, for example, one solar water heating company sold more than 60,000 units.

There are seven prime factors which enter into the cost of a solar-run home: the cost of the solar system, the cost of money or interest rates, the lifetime of the components of the solar system, maintenance, taxes and insurance, and the annual average of the energy collected by the system.

One scientist estimated that with the current state of the art, the cost of a solar electric/thermal system for a single family dwelling would exceed a conventional system by approximately \$3,000. Setting the interest rate at 6.5 percent, with 2.5 percent levelized amortization, and an average 3 percent maintenance and insurance charge, the cost of energy for such a home would be about \$360 per year. This represents about 12 percent of the initial cost. However, increased production and advances in technology would reduce this price.

Erich Farber, who is the director of the solar energy laboratory at the University of Florida, is well aware that installation costs of a solar system run about eight times as high as for electrical systems and about twice as much as for

gas. But he also estimates that a solar system will pay for itself in 7 or 8 years.

For most uses, the cost of converting solar energy to useful forms of energy is now higher than conventional sources, but with the increased prices of conventional fuels, shortages of those fuels and constraints on their use, it will surely become competitive in the near future.

Solar energy also sustains the winds. It is estimated that the power potential in the winds over the continental United States, the Aleutian Islands, and the eastern seaboard is about 10^{11} kilowatts of electricity. Winds are both repeatable and predictable, and the momentum could be extracted from the moving air by momentum-interchange machines located in places such as plains, valleys, and along the continental coast shelves.

The Solar Energy Panel has concluded that with adequate research and development support over the next 30 years, solar energy could provide us with at least 35 percent of the heating and cooling needs of future buildings, more than 30 percent of the methane and hydrogen we need for gaseous fuels, and eventually, greater than 20 percent of the electrical power we need. All of this could be done with a minimal effect on the environment and a substantial savings of non-renewable fuels.

H.R. 11566

A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to research and develop new building designs and construction methods which utilize solar energy and to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to increase the maximum amount of mortgages insured under title II of the National Housing Act for certain facilities utilizing solar energy.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Solar Energy Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall conduct research into how solar energy can be used to heat and cool buildings and shall collect appropriate weather data for the various climatic regions of the United States for the purpose of determining the extent to which reliance upon solar energy is feasible in each region.

(b) The Secretary shall—

(1) develop and test new building designs and construction methods which involve the utilization of solar energy equipment such as solar collectors, heat storage units, heat exchangers, absorption refrigeration equipment, and auxiliary heat supply facilities;

(2) prescribe standards and specifications for such building designs and construction methods; and

(3) specify the climatic regions of the United States where the use of such building designs and construction methods is practicable.

(c) The Secretary shall issue initial standards under subsection (b) (2) of this section not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act. Such standards shall be promptly published in the Federal Register and otherwise disseminated as widely as possible to the construction industry and to the general public.

(d) In carrying out the research, development, and testing required by this section, the Secretary shall consult with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and other Federal agencies engaged in housing and building regulation.

Sec. 3. Title II of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"HOUSING UTILIZING SOLAR ENERGY EQUIPMENT"

"Sec. 244. In determining the maximum dollar amount of a mortgage which may be insured under any section of this title with respect to any dwelling or residence which involves a building design or construction methods which meet the standards and specifications prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce under section 2(b) (2) of the Solar Energy Act of 1973, the Secretary may increase the maximum amount of a mortgage which may be insured under such section with respect to such dwelling or residence by the amount by which (as determined by the Secretary) the cost of using such building design or construction methods exceeds the cost of using conventional building design and construction methods."

MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, opponents of strict gun control legislation often contend that restrictions on private possession of firearms would unfairly deny homeowners the right to own handguns for self-protection. They claim that privately owned firearms are not a contributing factor to the crime problem. This allegation is tragically easy to refute. In almost any newspaper you pick up these days there is a story of an accidental shooting, which often results in death.

Citing a recent report, an editorial on the Washington radio station WTOP stated, "handguns kill friends and relatives and the users six times more often than the intruders." A recent newspaper story tells of a 12-year-old boy who was accidentally shot and killed by his 11-year-old playmate—just one illustration of the consequences of allowing the possession of handguns in the home.

Included below is the article from the November 6 Courier-News as well as the text of the WTOP editorial of November 13:

BOY, 12, SHOT

BRICK TOWNSHIP, N.J.—A 12-year-old boy was accidentally shot and killed Monday by an 11-year-old playmate toying with his father's .38 caliber target pistol, police said.

Kenneth Beatty was shot in the right side of the chest in the bedroom of his friend's home, near his own home. Police say the gun was loaded with five rounds of target bullets.

The boys had stayed home from school and were watching television and listening to records alone in the house, police said. The younger boy went into his parent's bedroom and took the pistol from a closet shelf.

[A WTOP editorial, Washington, D.C.]

HANDGUNS SHOULD BE BANNED FROM HOMES AS WELL AS THE STREETS, NOVEMBER 13 AND 14, 1973

A recent study indicates that guns in the home are more dangerous than useful as self-protection.

A four-year survey showed that death from

firearm accidents in the home was about six times more frequent than death from gunshot of burglars, robbers or intruders.

In fact, while death by accidental gunfire is still below the rates for auto and industrial accidents, it's increasing at much faster rates.

Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of these fatal firearm accidents resulted from handgun misuse.

This study is only one more piece of evidence that handguns should be banned, whether on the streets or in the home.

The only legitimate purpose that handguns in the home could have is to ward off intruders. But if handguns kill friends and relatives and the users six times more often than the intruders, they are grossly and tragically inefficient.

We are not talking about guns designed for reasons other than to kill people . . . such as hunting and sporting firearms. These guns are not the primary problem. We're talking instead about handguns, which exist basically for one reason: to kill people.

But more and more frequently, it seems, they are killing the wrong people.

Ridding our society of handguns is a cause we should keep alive.

This was a WTOP Editorial . . . Ray White speaking for WTOP.

SECRETARY MORTON BITES THE "ENERGY" BULLET

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, on November 15 the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior, spoke to the Rubber Manufacturers Association meeting here in Washington, D.C. The subject of his address was the "energy crisis." Secretary Morton's call for a reorientation of American attitudes toward energy is a challenge that all of us share. I include the text of his address be at this point in the RECORD for all to read:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROGERS C. B. MORTON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE RUBBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 15, 1973, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The energy crisis, at least for many Americans, is still asymptomatic. The unequivocal facts of supply and demand, however, tell another story. The energy crisis is here, and within the next four to six weeks there is going to be more than enough evidence to convince any skeptic.

Let's not be mistaken, the energy crisis is cold, dark, and disquieting news. It isn't going to go away. And no one is going to be able to order, litigate, or legislate it away from your door by the end of the year.

We are transitioning from an era where energy was a "given" in every business, manufacturing, or personal decision we made, into a period—and I'm talking about the balance of the decade—where every product we build, sell, buy or use is going to have an energy price on it.

We are entering an era where government and industry will be talking about "regulating shortages" instead of regulating supplies.

We are crossing the threshold into an era with an altogether new and forgotten generation experience—rigid fuel allocations, and the growing possibility of fuel rationing. On a personal basis this means that

there are no assurances that you can buy an unlimited supply of heating oil for your home, propane for your farm, gas for your car, or electrical power for your factory.

And when the short term aspects of this energy crisis are over we must all recognize that energy will cost more.

Let's examine the dimensions of our near term energy prospects.

First, our problem is neither physical, environmental, or geological. Instead, it is a function of time—and economics. It is a question of when we can bring new supplies to the market? And when we do, what kind of a price are we going to have to pay for it?

In the very short term, at least, we are going to have to make up the supply by managing the demand—and that means allocation today—and the possibility of some kind of rationing in the future.

Second, energy demand. The most evident reason for our current energy situation is that demand has been and is now growing at a geometric rate—doubling about every fifteen years. We have now reached the point where Americans will use as much energy in a year as half the rest of the world will use in the same period.

In fact, the 210 million people in the U.S. use more energy than the 500 million people in the other leading industrial nations including Germany, Great Britain, Japan and the Soviet Union combined.

Third, for a period of years—as far back as the mid-sixties—the U.S. has been moving away from energy self-sufficiency.

Since 1965, drilling activity for petroleum has been declining. And domestic oil production has continued to drop off, in spite of the fact that last year virtually all of our domestic wells were producing at 100 percent capacity.

Since 1968, we have been using natural gas faster than we discover it.

Coal—our greatest fossil fuel resource—has taken a declining share of our total energy supply because of technical, and environmental factors. Today, in fact, coal accounts for a smaller share of our energy supply curve, than it did twenty years ago.

And nuclear power provides a meager 1 percent of our total energy supply—about as much as we get from firewood.

The thing that is hard for all of us to understand is: How did these negative trends occur in this great land of plenty? We have nearly half the world's coal supply and many years reserves of oil and gas.

In the meantime, second generation energy sources such as fusion, solar energy, oil shale, and geothermal steam are still confined to the conceptual laboratory, or bench testing stage—in spite of all the wistful editorializing that "we plug into the sun, or make gasoline out of a top hat."

Fourth while energy supply and demand has continued to dance along a delicate razor's edge, the Arab oil embargo exacerbated a shortfall situation.

In the last few years, we have continued to underwrite a growing chunk of our economy with foreign oil imports.

Up until 1972, we were able to meet about 80 percent of our petroleum import needs in the Western Hemisphere.

Since then, however, production in Venezuela has leveled; Canadian supplies are tightening up; and the only other future in our oil portfolio—Arab oil—has disappeared.

The recent hostilities in the Mid-East have turned the threat of oil diplomacy into reality. The Arab oil embargo means a loss of between 2 and 2½ million barrels of oil a day—about a third of our total oil imports.

No matter how you add this up, we come up with a 12 to 15 percent shortage.

Whether we have an allocation program or not, I can promise you that consumption is going to drop by at least 2 million barrels a day by the end of the year.

And the reason it will drop is because we can't burn oil we don't have.

Even without the oil embargo—and it certainly hasn't helped—the oil import situation would have become tighter. The Arab members of the organization of petroleum exporting countries (OPEC) raised their prices 70 percent across the board in mid-October on top of sizeable increases earlier in the year.

All of these dimensions, consumption, supply, world market conditions, and a continuing trend away from domestic self-sufficiency bring us down to our only alternative: a thoroughly national effort to regain energy independence.

That is the program President Nixon called for last week. We need new legislation, new funding and, most important, new energy habits. That is what the President called for, and anything short of full support from everyone—the Congress, the private sector, and the consumer—could have severe consequences.

At the least we are going to have to use our finite energy resources as wisely and efficiently as possible. This means energy conservation, and an end to energy waste.

Let me be frank. No one I know of in Congress or in the administration wants to go to rationing. In fact, I would like to see us do everything within our grasp to keep from going to rationing. However, if the voluntary measures the President has outlined fail—and I hope they don't—we may find that there is no alternative except to go to rationing. The critical measure of whether that will happen is in the hands of the consumer. And with over 40 percent of our total energy supply going to industry—a large share of that decision is in your hands.

On the supply side, it is imperative that we accelerate the development and delivering of all domestic energy resources to the market.

A first major step will be to match our energy usage patterns with our energy resources.

Almost 90 percent of our domestic fossil fuel resources are coal. Yet American depends on natural gas and oil to meet almost 80 percent of our total energy needs, and coal's share is only about 17 percent. We may have to suffer a reduction in environmental quality temporarily—and this can be minimized—but anything less than a return to coal, will fail to see us through the near term.

We are going to have to accelerate the development of all energy resources. The President, for example, has called for tripling our outer continental shelf leasing programs to bring new supplies of natural gas and oil into the market.

It may seem incredible, but after almost two decades, less than 2 percent of the OCS has been leased. And to date, not a single exploratory well has been sunk on the Atlantic OCS.

We are going to have to bring new funding and greater momentum across the board in all of our energy R & D programs.

The perfection of coal gasification, for example, should enable us to convert coal into pipeline quality, synthetic gas. At expected rates of conversion, if our coal reserves were converted into gas, they would yield almost 6,000 trillion cubic feet of gas—many more than the world's known gas reserves of about 1,500 trillion cubic feet.

And the potential of oil shale, the breeder reactor, fusion, solar energy, and a number of other technologies still await economic development.

We are going to have to face hard decisions that lead to achievable goals within the inflexible constraints of time and money.

Many of these decisions will require ac-

cepting reasonable environmental tradeoffs and, for a brief period of time, harsh environmental impacts.

Still other decisions are going to call for massive amounts of capital, new funding, and a total reorientation of American attitudes towards energy.

One thing that we can be sure of, none of these decisions are going to be easy.

Most of these proposals require Congressional action. All of them, however, require the understanding, participation, and support of every facet of the American public.

Congress has shown a willingness to act to meet our national energy needs. Their action on legislation for the Trans-Alaska pipeline is a broad illustration of their necessary role in delineating a national energy policy. Hopefully, that momentum will extend to other critically needed energy legislation.

There is a limit, however, to what Government can do.

We know, for example, that many of our current energy dilemmas are the result of the infirmities of long-standing regulatory and economic policies which have retarded the development of our domestic resources.

Fortunately, there is still time—time to build new plants, time to develop new energy technology, time to match energy use with energy efficiency.

In the meantime, the dizzy economics of foreign oil have driven some of our new energy sources onto the edge of market economics. Oil shale, gasification and liquefaction processes for coal, and geothermal steam are ready to be brought to their potential—I say let's do it now.

Energy is the delicate sinew that binds our economy and our entire social system together. Without adequate supplies of energy, we have little hope of continuing our current way of life.

Our ability to produce needed raw materials, minerals, and even fibers, depends upon energy. The mining and minerals industries including fuels, for example, account for almost one-fourth of our total U.S. energy production.

Nothing, in my view, could be more disastrous than to create a severe and unwarranted disruption of vital business and production activity.

At the same time, however, we are going to have to take a hard and unbiased look at those operations that are not efficient—from an energy standpoint. And when we have to reduce energy supplies, ensure that we do it as equitably as possible.

Make no mistake about it. We are talking about jobs, about production, and about profits.

Fortunately, we still have a margin of time to re-evaluate, and re-examine our energy usage patterns. However, I would not be frank with each of you, unless I warned you that unless you do this, and do it now—more severe shortages could result in government stepping in and doing it for you.

It is a challenge that all of us share, and one that we can meet if we pursue it together—with a common spirit of determination.

PAUL A. KHASIGIAN BECOMES EAGLE SCOUT

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

Whereas, Paul A. Khasigian, son of Dr. and Mrs. Amos Khasigian of Ladera Heights, at the age of 13, has achieved the rank of Eagle Scout, highest rank a boy can attain in Scouting; and;

Whereas, Paul A. Khasigian, son of Dr. through the ranks of Scouting to the highest level attainable with 24 Merit Badges, while, at the same time, maintaining an outstanding scholarship record at Crozier Junior High School in Inglewood, and remaining active in Sunday School and Youth Service at St. James Armenian Apostolic Church, and;

Whereas, for his Eagle Service Project, Paul Khasigian, planned and directed part of a program for the cleaning and repair of the grounds of the historic Centinela Adobe, birthplace of the City of Inglewood.

Therefore, be it known this 20th day of November 1973, that we are in recognition of the outstanding accomplishments of this young man in the field of Scouting, and his exemplary conduct in his personal life, and further direct that this resolution be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AMNESTY: AN ONGOING CRITICAL ISSUE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, amnesty remains an issue of grave concern to me and to the thousands of young men and their families who refused to participate in the war in Vietnam. As the author of legislation that would grant universal, unconditional amnesty to all those who refused to participate or cooperate in that war I am please to include in the RECORD a statement of amnesty that has been signed by many leading Americans. In its eloquent plea for reconciliation and its reiteration of basic American principles, it is worthy of note. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF AMNESTY—OCTOBER 1973

We ask again that the public and the government face the fact that for all that has happened in our Vietnamese war, only men who are young have been or are being punished; and that in disproportionate numbers these men are non-white and from low economic estate.

We are speaking of those men who are or were imprisoned for refusing induction; of those who expatriated themselves before or after induction or who have lived underground; and of those given "less-than-honorable" or other discriminatory discharges from the military.

We believe that justice—justice that is symmetrical in its equal treatment of all citizens—requires an unconditional amnesty, pardon, or fair restitution for all men who are charged with, may be charged with, or have been convicted for offenses arising out of their refusal to participate in the military action in Southeast Asia, or for offenses against military law while doing so.

A country which has found only a lieutenant guilty for My Lai, has found no one legally culpable for the massive deception revealed in the Pentagon Papers and in the disclosures of later lawlessness and deceit in the war's conduct, has seen its honor sacked by Watergate and similar affairs—

such a country so long as it may belong to a just people cannot now impose its penalties only on these young and powerless men. That cannot be fair, cannot be in keeping with our best ideals.

Our war, we trust, is over. The nation now has much to do, much that it can do only as a united people. There is too little mutual trust among us, too much that is corrosive of hopes and spirits.

A general and unconditional amnesty would be a simple and clear act. It would be a sign that we want to live at peace with each other, that we want to end within ourselves the awful divisions caused by the war, that we want to get on with the work of making this a better land.

Who can be opposed to such an act? Can the dead speak, and advise us; or can any speak for them? Would we really want to turn to parents of the dead and set them speaking against each other, some urging amnesty and some opposed?

Are veterans (including former prisoners of war) opposed? They appear divided, many for, many against, many indifferent. Although interest and weight do attach to the views of the veterans of this war who were themselves enlisted men, even they, in the tradition of our civil society, have now to advance those views as citizens, and not as a distinct group.

Can Congressmen and members of the administration, both present and former ones, who put us into the war and who kept us in it so long, have it in their hearts to absolve themselves while they hurt these young men?

Can those Congressmen who opposed the war, in the way the public empowered them to do, want to hurt those powerless men who opposed the war in the only way they could or knew how, men who in the process helped create and sustain that public disgust with the war which finally gave some success to Congressional effort to end it?

We believe that Congress and the President are, in fact, fully free to act for amnesty, and that they cannot rightfully claim to be held back by constituents' pressures. We believe amnesty, as was segregation in the South, is an issue wherein statesmen would not trade on fears but can, and therefore should, lead. We believe that the people will respond helpfully to forthright leadership, as did people in the South when segregation was outlawed.

We believe that if Congress or the President will give the American people the opportunity to be generous and just, the nation will be so. We ask for that opportunity.

Does this nation, that was established to "form a more perfect union" and to "insure domestic tranquility," not want to heal itself? Do we not want to take this chance on justice?

There are few acts a government can decide upon that clearly and immediately benefit individuals; amnesty would be one. We think it would be even more. We would be saying to ourselves that we now put the Vietnam war behind us, with its terrible freight of bitterness and recrimination, and of corruption and brutality too. We would signal a decisive turning away from the darkness of the war years, and toward rebuilding and restoring and healing, both here and, as we are morally bound to do, in Indo-China. We also would be affirming to ourselves that America has no time or need for vengeance against ourselves, and especially not against our youth. We would, instead, be welcoming the return, as free members of a freer society, of young men who can give much to the future—theirs and ours and our country's.

Roger Baldwin, founder and former Director, American Civil Liberties Union.

Rev. Eugene Carson Blake, retired General Secretary, World Council of Churches.

Rabbi Irwin M. Blank, Temple Ohabei Shalom, Brookline, Mass.

Rev. Robert McAfee Brown, Professor of Religious Studies, Stanford University.

Heywood Burns, Director, National Conference of Black Lawyers.

Rev. Will D. Campbell, Director, Committee of Southern Churchmen.

Rev. W. Sterling Cary, President, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Kenneth B. Clark, Professor of Social Psychology, City University of New York; President, Metropolitan Applied Research Center.

Rev. William Sloane Coffin Jr., Chaplain, Yale University.

John R. Coleman, President, Haverford College.

Robert Coles, psychiatrist, Harvard University; author.

Dorothy Day, Editor and publisher, *The Catholic Worker*.

Patricia M. Derian, Democratic National Committeewoman from Mississippi.

Leslie Dunbar, Executive Director, The Field Foundation.

Vernon A. Eagle, Executive Director, The New World Foundation.

Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Erik H. Erikson, psychoanalyst and author.

W. H. Ferry, Executive Director, D.J.B. Foundation.

Lawrence J. Friedman, President, U.S. National Student Association.

Willard Gaylin, Professor of Psychiatry and Law, Columbia University; author.

Ernest Gruening, former U.S. Senator from Alaska.

Michael Harrington, Chairman, Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee; author.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame.

M. Carl Holman.

David R. Hunter.

Rev. James M. Lawson, Jr., Pastor, Centenary Methodist Church, Memphis, Tenn.

John Lewis, Executive Director, Voter Education Project, Atlanta, Georgia.

Robert Jay Lifton, Professor of Psychiatry, Yale University.

Benjamin E. Mays, President, Board of Education, Atlanta, Georgia; President Emeritus, Morehouse College.

David McReynolds, War Resisters League.

Charles Morgan, Jr., Executive Director, Washington National Office, American Civil Liberties Union.

The Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Jr., Bishop of New York, Episcopal Church.

Rev. Robert V. Moss, President, United Church of Christ.

Aryeh Neier, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union.

Rev. Kenneth Neigh, retired General Secretary of the former Board of National Missions of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Eleanor Holmes Norton, Chairwoman, New York City Commission on Human Rights.

Hon. Justine Wise Poller.

Roy Pierce, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan.

Daniel H. Pollitt, Professor of Law, University of North Carolina Law School.

Charles O. Porter, former U.S. Congressman from Oregon; Chairman, National Committee for Amnesty Now.

Rev. Stephen G. Prichard, Director of Training, Institutes of Religion and Health.

Louise Ransom, Director, Americans for Amnesty; Gold Star Mother.

Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Counsel, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Milton J. E. Senn, Sterling Professor Emeritus of Pediatrics and Psychiatry, Yale University.

Charles E. Silberman, Director, The Study of Law and Justice; author.

William P. Thompson, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

John William Ward, President, Amherst College.

Raymond M. Wheeler, President, Southern Regional Council; Chairman, Children's Foundation; physician.

Andrew J. Young, Member of Congress from Georgia.

(Titles for identification only.)

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS— IMPEACHMENT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, on November 15 my most recent effort to delineate the increasingly complex issues that now surround the so-called Watergate affair appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The response from my colleagues and others has been gratifying.

Last week—Monday, November 19—the Wall Street Journal editorial page contained an editorial and an article which are relevant to what I said on November 15.

I find myself in agreement with the editorial and feel the article on the impeachment trial of President Johnson gives us some perspective on the events of today. I recommend them to my colleagues who, along with myself, continue to seek what insight we can as we grapple with the issues confronting us.

The editorial and article follow:

CONGRESS BURDEN

Now that a serious impeachment investigation is in the offing, Congress has assumed the duty of assuring the public that justice is done in the Watergate affair. It is a heavy burden for a body that shows all the weaknesses of any other committee of 535 souls.

It is to Congress' credit that the House has overwhelmingly voted to finance the impeachment investigation at \$1 million. If the investigation itself seems competent and fair, it could do much to clear the air. But the hassle over President Nixon's meetings with Congressmen, and the confusion over the creation of a special prosecutor, are not encouraging omens on the kind of investigation we are likely to see.

As the House was voting funds for the investigation, Democratic leader Thomas O'Neill was criticizing Mr. Nixon for meeting with congressional Republicans. The President, Mr. O'Neill charged, was trying to influence the grand jury that would hear his case. Yet the President still is President, and it is his responsibility to build political support to run the nation. Dealing with Watergate certainly is part and parcel of this task. Surely it is unreasonable to expect the President to cloister himself while the House waits until January or later to take up the charges against him, which charges in any event remain unspecified. That the President is explaining himself must be rated a plus, especially after all the charges of presidential isolation, regardless of the audience he chooses.

A more apt criticism would be that in meeting with audiences based on party affiliation, Mr. Nixon is trying to depict Watergate and impeachment as purely partisan

issues. The Democratic leadership would be on firmer ground in making this criticism if Democrats had taken greater pains to avoid partisanship. If they are serious about impeachment, a moment's thought and a little arithmetic should convince them that the absolute key is taking along a good number of Republicans. If Democrats ignore this point, they will be seen as wanting not to resolve the crisis but to wield a partisan club.

Congress is also showing a lack of direction in coping with the issue of protecting a special prosecutor. Its favorite idea was to have the courts appoint a prosecutor, who would also be charged with giving Congress anything relevant to impeachment. But two of the judges who would be involved in such an appointment have made it clear they want nothing to do with it, that they see their job not as prosecuting but as judging.

Here again it seems to us the answer is a serious impeachment investigation. We see little reason to conclude that a special prosecutor within the Executive Branch could not investigate and if appropriate prosecute, say, John Mitchell or John Ehrlichman. As a practical matter, Leon Jaworski has considerable leverage in resisting pressures to slow such investigations. The real problem comes in investigating the President himself. Investigating the President is the prerogative of Congress; that is why the Founding Fathers created the impeachment power.

Yet so far Congress has shown little disposition to put most of its chips behind the impeachment investigation. This is partly due to a lack of leadership, both on the House Judiciary Committee and more broadly in the Congress as a whole. But we sense that a great many in Congress do not really want a serious investigation. Some of them are afraid that the point will come when they must say, yes, there is evidence for impeachment. But others are equally afraid that the point will come when they must say, no, there is no evidence for impeachment.

It is the habit of Congress, as of other committees, to avoid difficult decisions whenever possible. But considering the duty to reassure the public that our system of government can cope with the extraordinary difficulties it faces, we hope that Congress can somehow find the leadership that will enable it to reach a clean decision, based on an investigation that is competent, bipartisan and above all open-minded.

THE BIG IMPEACHMENT TRIAL OF 1868 (By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—That was the dramatic declaration of George T. Brown, Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate, ceremonially opening on March 13, 1868, the impeachment trial of President Andrew Johnson. The President, however, did not stride dramatically into the Senate chamber to face his accusers, that day or ever during the trial that lasted until May 26. Three of his lawyers answered for him.

So that's one precedent. If the House should ever impeach Richard Nixon, he could follow the Johnson example and not go personally to the Capitol for his Senate trial. Indeed, Mr. Nixon and all future Presidents, and all Congresses as well, would be governed closely by the precedents established during that winter and spring of 1868. Because a President has never been impeached before, the people who conducted those proceedings were terribly aware they were also setting the pattern for impeachments to come.

At the outset, Chief Justice Salmon Chase told the Senate: "All good citizens will fervently pray that no occasion may ever arise when the grave proceedings now in progress will be cited as a precedent, but it is not impossible that such an occasion may come."

The Constitution, for example, specified only that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court would be the Senate's presiding officer

when a President is on trial. But how would a judge "preside" over a legislative body acting as a jury? Could he rule whether evidence was admissible? Could he break a tie vote of Senators?

He would learn the answers to that and more before the trial was over. And now all the precedents of the Johnson impeachment and trial, squirreled away in congressional archives these many years, have been dusted off and re-examined as the House takes its first tentative steps toward Mr. Nixon's possible impeachment.

UGLY AND TROUBLED TIMES

Congress today may be able to re-create the impeachment machinery used 105 years ago against Andrew Johnson, but fortunately it can't recapture the ugly spirit of that troubled time. The situation then facing the country was far more serious than now. The Civil War had ended militarily but not politically. Ten of the 11 Confederate states still weren't represented in Congress. Abraham Lincoln's let-'em-up-easy Reconstruction policies hadn't been fully formulated at the time of his death, and as President Johnson tried to put them in practice, the dominant congressional Republicans objected that the presidentially sanctioned new state governments in the South were eroding the North's Civil War victory.

Particularly irksome were the "Black Codes" denying rights to former slaves that had been adopted by all-white Southern legislatures. For his part, the President, a Tennessee Democrat who had run in 1864 with Mr. Lincoln on a one-time "Union" ticket, accused the Republicans of trying to keep the secession states out of Congress until they, too, embraced the GOP. Narrowly Mr. Johnson was charged with official misconduct, but the impeachment really was part of a broad policy struggle over how to put the American union back together again.

Can a President be impeached just because Congress disagrees with him about this policy or that? If so, it would require a rather loose construction of the Constitution's murky list of impeachable offenses: "treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors." Three years ago just that kind of loose construction was being pushed by soon-to-be Vice President Gerald Ford in seeking the impeachment of Supreme Court Justice William Douglas. Rep. Ford told the House that an impeachable offense "is whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers it to be at a given moment in history."

But the House didn't buy that in 1970, and it wasn't buying it in 1867, either, when an impeachment drive began against Mr. Johnson. The House Judiciary Committee in November of that year recommended impeachment to the full House, enumerating a list of grievances against the President. During House debate in early December Rep. James Wilson of Iowa, a Republican who opposed impeachment, called the judiciary committee report "a bundle of generalities" and asked: "If we cannot state upon paper a specific crime, how are we to carry this case to the Senate for trial?" On Dec. 7, the House rejected impeachment by a vote of 108 to 57.

There's a lesson in that vote for Sen. George Aiken and others who urge that the House either impeach Mr. Nixon or "get off his back." For President Johnson, there was no deadline for the question to be settled by the House "one way or another." As with the unfolding Watergate story this year, his fight with Congress was an unending series of slams and shocks, of Reconstruction bills angrily vetoed and grimly overridden, of harsh insults traded by both sides. On Feb. 21, 1868, just two and a half months after the first House vote, the President dropped the next bombshell by appointing Gen. Lorenzo Thomas Secretary of war.

THE STANTON PROBLEM

The problem was that according to the Senate, Edwin Stanton still filled that job under terms of an 1867 law requiring Senate approval of the dismissal of Executive Branch officers. Mr. Stanton, a Lincoln appointee who disapproved of Johnson-type Reconstruction, had been fired by the President in August, 1867. But encouraged by congressional Republicans, Mr. Stanton kept physical possession of his office, and on Feb. 21 the Senate formally voted 28 to 6 not to concur with his removal. Right then, the President appeared to be breaking the Tenure of Office Act, which pointedly classified any violation as a "high misdemeanor."

Now the House had what it lacked in December: a presidential deed equivalent to an indictable crime. Three days later the House voted 128 to 47 for impeachment.

The 11 articles of impeachment the House finally approved reflected the continuing uncertainty about kind of offense for which a President could be tried. The first nine articles dealt in several ways with the Stanton firing, the supposed violation of law. The tenth article was closer to the political heart of the quarrel with the President. It accused him of going around the country making speeches "in a loud voice" intended "to bring into disgrace, ridicule, hatred, contempt and reproach the Congress of the United States. . . ." The last article combined in a hybrid package allegations of both the political crime of denigrating the laws of Congress and the legal crime of firing Edwin Stanton.

Across the Capitol in the marble Senate wing, then just nine year old, the 54 members of course knew what the House had been doing and were getting ready for their big moment. Rules for conducting the trial were drawn up, and on March 4 seven House "managers," or prosecutors, appeared in the Senate chamber for a formal reading of the articles of impeachment. Sergeant-at-Arms Brown, who seemed to have all the good lines, sang out:

"Hear Ye! Hear Ye! Hear Ye! All persons are commanded to keep silence on pain of imprisonment while the House of Representatives is exhibiting to the Senate of the United States articles of impeachment against Andrew Johnson, President of the United States."

Any modern spectator returning to those packed galleries (1,000 tickets were printed for use each day) would have seen that the Senate was behaving, well, like the Senate. Procedural bickering broke out continually, requiring roll-call votes on the pickiest details. But some of the procedural matters were important. Democratic Sen. Garrett Davis of Kentucky objected that no trial could be held until Senators from the 10 absent Southern states were admitted; he was voted down 49 to 2.

Early in the trial, one of the President's lawyers objected to a question asked of a witness, but Chief Justice Chase ruled the question should be answered. A Senator protested that the Chief Justice should have let the Senate itself decide, without making a preliminary ruling. The wrangling continued until someone suggested that the Senate go to a nearby conference chamber to argue in private. That was put to a vote, and it was a tie, 25 to 25. The Chief Justice broke the tie by voting "aye." (Note that, Chief Justice Burger.) In the end, the Senate decided 31 to 19 to let the Chief Justice rule on admissibility of evidence, but that the rulings could be appealed to a vote of the full Senate.

A ticklish question came up at the time Senators were swearing their special oath to do "impartial justice" during the trial. A Johnson loyalist said the oath shouldn't be given to Ohio Republican Benjamin Wade, who was the Senate's President Pro Tempore.

The law of succession in those days put Sen. Wade next in line for the presidency because there was no Vice President. Letting him vote to put himself into the White House at Mr. Johnson's expense would be a blatant conflict of interest, but the Senate let him be sworn anyway and be ultimately voted "guilty." That wasn't the only instance of suspected partiality. Voting "not guilty" was Democratic. Sen. David Patterson of Tennessee, President Johnson's son-in-law.

As the trial progressed the President's lawyers argued Mr. Johnson didn't really violate the Tenure of Office Act because it didn't apply to Mr. Stanton. The Secretary of War, they said, was a Lincoln appointee whose protection under that law ran out with the former President's death. Somewhat contradictorily, the White House lawyers also claimed that Mr. Johnson fired Mr. Stanton to get a court test of a law he considered unconstitutional. Thus he had no criminal intent.

President Johnson never did get his test, but the Supreme Court in 1926 ruled that Congress can't interfere with the Executive's power of dismissal within his own branch. That decision has been studied closely in recent weeks by members of Congress trying to figure out how to write a law preventing President Nixon from firing a new special Watergate prosecutor.

On May 16 the Senate was finally ready to vote on conviction itself. A separate vote would occur on each of the 11 articles of impeachment, and a two-thirds majority for "guilty" on any one of them would topple the President from office.

The House managers wanted the first vote to come on the eleventh article, deemed to be the strongest because it combined both the legal and political charges. Just before the roll call Republican Sen. James Grimes of Iowa, who had suffered a stroke two days previously, was carried into the chamber to his desk. Chief Justice Chase admonished the galleries to keep "absolute silence and perfect order."

Republican Sen. Henry Anthony of Rhode Island was first on the alphabetical list of 54 members.

The Chief Justice addressed him: "Mr. Senator Anthony, how say you? Is the respondent, Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, guilty, or not guilty, of a high misdemeanor as charged in this article of impeachment?"

"Guilty."

The Chief Justice asked his tortuous question 53 more times, and at the end of the roll call the tally was 35 "guilty" and 19 "not guilty."

One vote short.

The chair ruled: Two-thirds of the Senators present not having pronounced him guilty, Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, stands acquitted of the charges contained in the eleventh article of impeachment."

The losers quickly moved to adjourn the Senate for 10 days, in hopes of converting at least one of the seven Republicans who had voted for acquittal. But on May 26 the lineup was exactly the same on the second and third articles. The Senators saw no reason to keep voting and the trial was over for good.

HISTORY AND REVISIONISM

The impeachers of Andrew Johnson generally have received a bad press from historians, who tend to cast the struggle in terms used by Sen. Edmund Ross of Kansas, one of the seven Republicans to vote for acquittal. Had Mr. Johnson been pulled down, Sen. Ross wrote later, "the office of President would be degraded, cease to be a co-ordinate branch of the government, and ever after subordinate to the Legislative will."

Sen. Ross was lionized for his acquittal votes by Sen. John Kennedy in his 1956 book, "Profiles in Courage." Sen. Ross "may well

have preserved for ourselves and posterity constitutional government in the United States," Sen. Kennedy wrote.

More recently, however, revisionists have been at work, concluding that the Republicans had no other defense against a President who was trying to freeze Congress out of policymaking at a time of grave national peril. In his 1973 book "The Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson," Ohio State University Assistant History Professor Michael Benedict puts it this way:

"In many ways, Johnson was a very modern President, holding a view of presidential authority that has only recently been established. Impeachment was Congress' defensive weapon; it proved a dull blade and the end result is that the only effective recourse against a President who ignores the will of Congress or exceeds his powers is democratic removal at the polls."

That may well be true when attempted impeachments are the climax of heavy policy fights, as in the Johnson case. But the impeachment weapon was really intended to be unsheathed against blatant personal misconduct by high officials of the government, whether it be obstruction of justice for political ends or stealing money or something worse. If strong evidence of personal crime is ever lodged against a President, the Senate Sergeant at Arms will be reaching for that "hear ye" script again, and the impeachment blade may prove sharper than it was in 1868.

VOTING TO RECOMMIT CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, I joined 271 of my colleagues in voting to recommit the conference report on H.R. 8877.

Although there were no instructions, it is hoped that a more equitable ESEA title I allocation definition will result from the recommittal.

I have been provided with some background data on this subject by Dr. Eugene C. Samter, executive secretary of the Conference of Large City Boards of Education in New York. I take this opportunity to insert Dr. Samter's letter and accompanying tables into the Record, and commend them to the attention of the conferees and Members of Congress:

CONFERENCE OF LARGE
CITY BOARDS OF EDUCATION,
Albany, N.Y., November 21, 1973.

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Continuing efforts by a large majority of the New York congressional delegation to assure that Labor-HEW appropriations for FY 1974 will contain an equitable ESEA Title I allocation for New York State's disadvantaged children are most appreciated. As you know, 32 members of the New York delegation joined with 242 other U.S. Representatives in voting to recommit H.R. 8877 to Senate-House Conference Committee, with the inference that the allocation limits must be more justly defined with respect to where the poor children are located.

Several proposals have been made to remove or relax the upper limit on the percentage increase in Title I funds which lo-

cal education agencies may receive in 1974. The most recent, by Congressman Quile, would remove the maximum LEA percentage increase while assuring local districts at least 90 percent of their 1973 funds. It also applies a 120 percent of 1973 limitation to the amount any state may receive.

Those who oppose proposals such as that of Congressman Quile declare, among other points, that it will cause the AFDC part of the formula to be overly influential this year in determining allocations. This is unfair and inaccurate for several reasons.

First, the inference that AFDC in 1974 will suddenly blossom forth as a controlling factor is misleading. In point of fact, the count of AFDC children has been used annually since 1965 to update the count of poor children which otherwise would have been frozen at the 1960 census level. We should emphasize, too, that nobody, including HEW specialists, has made available any other more adequate data which is provided county-by-county on an annual basis.

Secondly, it is an exaggeration to say that 1974 allocations will be changed from those of 1973 primarily because of AFDC counts. Table I attached shows that the most significant cause of shifts in funds is the changeover from 1960 census to 1970 census, not the annual change in numbers of AFDC children. For example, the 1970 census shows that the proportion of the nation's low-income children found in New York State has increased 81 percent, while it has dropped 50 percent in Kentucky. By contrast, only five states have either increased or decreased their concentrations of AFDC children by more than 30 percent.

Finally, we refute the contention that because of the use of AFDC data, "only the richest states in the country have been able to increase their numbers of Title I children every year, while the poorest states are left with only the same numbers of children counted under the census." (See *Congressional Record*, 11/12/73, 36653). Table II attached shows that no such relationship exists. For example, New York, with the highest per capita income, ranked 37th in terms of its increase in AFDC children. On the other hand, Louisiana, 46th in per capita income shows the 4th highest percentage increase in AFDC children.

It seems important to lay to rest some of the misunderstandings about the determination of eligibles under ESEA Title I. If your efforts in this respect are successful, at least the intent of this legislation to help the economically disadvantaged will remain intact, even though its implementation has been seriously hampered by inadequate and late funding.

Sincerely,

EUGENE C. SAMTER,
Executive Secretary.

TABLE I.—Comparative importance of census versus AFDC in changes in eligibility under ESEA title I

[Percent increase or decrease]	
Proportion of the Nation's low-income children from 1960 census to 1970 census:	
Connecticut	100.0
Nevada	100.0
California	94.2
New York	81.4
New Jersey	80.1
Washington	68.6
Louisiana	66.5
Massachusetts	66.3
District of Columbia	63.3
Alaska	60.0
Oregon	54.1
Utah	50.0
Hawaii	50.0
Maryland	49.5
New Hampshire	41.6
Colorado	41.2

TABLE I.—Comparative importance of census versus AFDC in changes in eligibility under ESEA title I—Continued

[Percent increase or decrease]	
Proportion of the Nation's low-income children from 1960 census to 1970 census—Continued	
Arizona	40.5
Delaware	40.0
New Mexico	39.4
Rhode Island	37.5
Florida	32.3
Illinois	31.5
Ohio	28.3
Indiana	25.9
Michigan	25.4
Wyoming	18.1
Nebraska	14.2
Idaho	12.0
Wisconsin	11.0
Pennsylvania	9.3
Montana	7.7
Kansas	3.7
Maine	2.7
Texas	-10.5
Missouri	-11.4
Vermont	-13.3
Oklahoma	-17.5
Minnesota	-22.4
Virginia	-24.4
Alabama	-25.9
Georgia	-27.4

Mississippi	-27.5
Tennessee	-30.5
South Dakota	-33.8
Arkansas	-34.1
South Carolina	-34.9
North Dakota	-36.1
West Virginia	-37.6
Iowa	-41.3
North Carolina	-42.5
Kentucky	-50.3

Proportion of the Nation's AFDC children from fiscal year 1972 to fiscal year 1973:

Georgia	100.0
North Carolina	43.4
Indiana	43.1
Louisiana	39.0
Washington	28.4
Wisconsin	17.4
Wyoming	16.7
Florida	16.7
Michigan	16.5
District of Columbia	15.2
Utah	15.0
Oregon	14.9
Illinois	14.4
Nevada	14.3
Texas	13.6
Ohio	8.5
Hawaii	7.7
Idaho	5.3
New Hampshire	5.3

Colorado	4.5
Virginia	4.1
Maine	1.7
Minnesota	1.5
Massachusetts	1.1
Arkansas	
Mississippi	
Tennessee	
Connecticut	-0.7
Pennsylvania	-1.2
Maryland	-2.2
Kentucky	-3.0
Rhode Island	-3.5
Nebraska	-4.0
Vermont	-5.0
Iowa	-5.4
Delaware	-5.6
North Dakota	-5.9
Missouri	-6.6
Alaska	-6.7
Oklahoma	-7.1
New Jersey	-8.1
New York	-8.6
Montana	-10.5
California	-11.5
West Virginia	-12.0
Arizona	-13.1
South Dakota	-16.7
New Mexico	-19.2
Alabama	-25.0
Kansas	-27.1
South Carolina	-82.7

TABLE II.—RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A STATE'S WEALTH AND INCREASE IN AFDC ELIGIBLE CHILDREN UNDER ESEA TITLE I

AFDC children under ESEA title I						Per capita income	
State	Fiscal year 1972	Fiscal year 1973	Increase (decrease)			Calendar 1971	Ranking
			Amount	Percent	Ranking		
Georgia	45,995	45,995	100.0		1	\$3,599	34
Indiana	31,760	51,115	19,355	60.9	2	4,027	21
North Carolina	24,386	39,056	14,670	60.2	3	3,424	39
Louisiana	12,006	18,778	6,772	56.4	4	3,252	46
Washington	37,092	53,472	16,380	44.2	5	4,132	17
Florida	19,292	25,472	6,180	32.0	6	3,930	24
Wisconsin	35,418	46,691	11,273	31.8	7	3,912	27
Michigan	148,837	194,106	45,269	30.4	8	4,430	12
Utah	11,591	15,058	3,467	29.9	9	3,442	37
Illinois	211,327	270,392	59,065	28.0	10	4,775	6
Texas	62,250	79,326	17,076	27.4	11	3,726	31
New Hampshire	5,414	6,698	1,284	23.7	12	3,796	30
Wyoming	1,791	2,213	442	23.6	13	3,929	25
Hawaii	11,356	13,902	2,546	22.4	14	4,738	7
Ohio	113,416	137,774	24,358	21.5	15	4,175	14
Idaho	5,587	6,570	983	17.6	16	3,409	40
Virginia	42,991	50,142	7,151	16.6	17	3,899	28
Colorado	32,509	37,295	4,786	14.7	18	4,153	15
Minnesota	39,624	45,154	5,530	14.0	19	4,032	19
Maine	17,329	19,721	2,392	13.8	20	3,375	41
Massachusetts	104,790	118,674	13,884	13.3	21	4,562	10
Connecticut	42,253	47,116	4,863	11.5	22	4,995	2
Pennsylvania	223,225	246,945	23,720	10.6	23	4,147	16
Kentucky	29,527	32,334	3,077	10.4	24	3,306	42
Maryland	53,908	59,407	5,499	10.2	25	4,522	11

AFDC children under ESEA title I						Per capita income	
State	Fiscal year 1972	Fiscal year 1973	Increase (decrease)			Calendar 1971	Ranking
			Amount	Percent	Ranking		
Delaware	5,228	5,711	483	9.2	26	\$4,673	8
Nebraska	14,487	15,821	1,334	9.2	27	4,030	20
Vermont	5,821	6,325	504	8.7	28	3,638	32
Rhode Island	17,038	18,308	1,270	7.5	29	4,126	18
Alaska	4,444	4,723	279	6.3	30	4,875	3
North Dakota	4,849	5,150	301	6.2	31	3,538	35
Oklahoma	28,836	30,372	1,536	5.3	32	3,515	36
Iowa	27,270	29,074	1,804	5.0	33	3,877	29
Missouri	35,433	37,152	1,719	4.9	34	3,940	23
Nevada	165,912	170,877	4,965	3.0	35	4,811	5
New York	3,369	2,427	-942	-28.2	36	4,822	4
Tennessee	553,315	565,968	12,653	2.3	37	5,000	1
Arkansas					38	3,300	43
Mississippi					39	3,078	49
Arizona	17,717	17,624	-93	-.5	40	2,788	50
Alabama	1,078	1,074	-4	-.4	41	3,913	26
Montana	5,610	5,575	-35	-.6	42	3,087	48
West Virginia	14,684	14,553	-131	-.9	43	3,629	33
California	566,387	560,993	-5,394	-1.0	44	3,275	45
Oregon	27,737	26,326	-1,411	-5.1	45	4,640	9
New Mexico	15,180	13,975	-1,205	-7.9	46	3,959	22
South Dakota	7,134	6,537	-597	-8.4	47	3,298	44
Kansas	27,933	23,011	-4,922	-17.6	48	3,441	38
South Carolina	21,877	4,561	-17,316	-79.2	49	4,192	13
					50	3,142	47

RELIGION AND PSYCHIATRY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the question of how religion and psychiatry can work together in our troubled times has many facets. Several cogent comments are offered by Rabbi Martin Weitz in an article in the summer 1973 Colorado Quarterly.

I share here some excerpts from the article. The author is director of interfaith studies at Lincoln University and rabbi to the Adas Shalom Temple in Havre de Grace, Md.

RELIGION AND PSYCHIATRY

(By Martin M. Weitz)

Two worlds—religion and psychiatry—have had much common and uncommon ground in

recent decades in their search for values at their ablest and bravest. Like the continental plate theory described in "This Changing Earth" (*National Geographic Magazine*, January, 1973), whereby a super-continent broke loose into moving sectors which now often collide with one another's edges; so too religion and psychiatry may be apart from and then become a part of one another.

A case in point is the "holiday paradox," described so fully in *Newsweek* (January 8, 1973), which reveals that suicides peak sharply after Christmas and New Year's, the "worst week of the year," according to Dr. Robert Litman of the Los Angeles Suicide Prevention Center. Depression, long the leading mental illness in the U.S., is now epidemic, with suicides, 50,000 to 70,000, its frequent aftermath. In mortality rates alone, the figures are comparable to those for diabetes and leukemia. *Newsweek* claims that 125,000 Americans are hospitalized annually with depression, while another 200,000 are treated by psychiatrists and physicians, and that another 4,000,000 to 8,000,000 are in need of help but do not know it. Though this depression is spreading among youth because

of the frustration of war, of environmental pressures and confusion over values—"even drug-taking is in reality self-medication for depression"—there is a glow of hope beyond the grim statistics. Factors that help include new anti-depressant drugs that prevent re-occurrences as well as relieve depression, lithium salts, electroshock therapy, and psychotherapy.

Too many—even after they learn to know classics for conscience, as the above—look askance at religion through imaginary lenses of psychiatry, especially if they prefer to view religion as antiquated and therefore useless while psychiatry is wholly modern, therefore useful. They would equate "holiness in celibacy" as dread of home and parenthood, behavior of children in language of faith as neurotic dependence on others, fundamentalism's attack on evolution as dread of its power in reality, perils of non-conformity in organized religion as flight from modern pressures, belief in resurrection as related to primitive smearing of blood over a corpse, the appearance of angels even more than God in dreams with ease of identity with childlike qualities of angels, election of any people to

compensation for its real frustration, singing of hymns as return to infantile patterns and infancy, insistence on preservation of present mores as fear of the unknown and love of the status quo, redemption via great heroes as need for group heroics and dramatics, sanctions for war as noble cause, for joys in mass participation, freedom from worry, flight from futility and monotony, nostrum for corrosive psychic ills as well as a way to act out in reality unresolved conflicts of personality.

Closer to our times, more psychiatrists, as in growing areas of science in general, are not only on speaking terms but on seeking terms with religion in a common quest for human values that may be tinted with faith as well as reason. This is also due in no small measure to hosts of believers added to religion and all its activities and experiences, to a greater need for meaning beyond the limited world of secularization and science of a decade ago, and also to an enlightened social awareness and personal conscience recovered by the leadership and fellowship of major faiths of the West in the face of such common foes as totalitarianism, conformism, secrecy in government, and potential atomic annihilation. There is world-wide need indeed for much less anxiety and much more faith.

It is, therefore, in a mood friendly and favorable to religion that a number of foremost psychiatrists have these declarations to make: Mukerjee: "Religion adjusts inner conflict in crisis of sex, food, birth; this adjustment brings stability in the life of individual and in the organization of society." Rakness: "Religion is organization of ecstatic experiences without which whole personality might disintegrate." Kuenkel: "Religion emanates from a sense of inadequacy and bespeaks man's attempt to feel superior to the forces that envelop him." Pfister: "Religion is not a neurotic compulsion but a release from it." Bastide: "Religion may be not a neurosis, but a successful dealing with it." Halliday: "Psychology has a true service to render religion in disturbing the complacency with which most people regard themselves and in showing that we seldom are what we think we are." Fromm: "Religion should aim to make man fully human, to be able to enfold, to give love and devotion and in which psychoanalysis could play a role by helping man to overcome greed, folly, anger, fear and his illusions about nature, reality, and himself."

Beyond these spokesmen and soul-probers of a generation ago, we find in our own day doctors and ministers, as well as psychoanalysts and theologians, together sharing a groping and growing awareness of a relationship between faith and health as they strive to serve the ill. No longer as in the past do the doctors and the clergymen find themselves in competitive roles. Instead the men in white and in black, aware of a relationship between faith and health, are joining force in mutual concern for the "whole" patient. The confessional of the chaplain and the couch of the analyst have helped the patient more than ever before, especially in the "twilight zones" of depression. In the National Academy of Religion and Mental Health, there are over six hundred members of the American Psychiatric Association, six hundred psychologists as social workers and laymen, and six hundred clergymen of all major faiths. This organization is paralleled by regional units coordinating pastoral care and clinical experience and is guided by what the great physician Sir William Osler once asserted: "Nothing in life is more wonderful than faith—the one great moving force we can neither weigh in the balance nor test in the crucible."

A most worthy goal for the 1970s is for religion and psychiatry to have less of conflict and more of cooperation than ever before. Simple clarifications of these two avenues that often merge as a modern highway and then part company after hurdling a

mountain range, linking several cities or bridging common obstacles as streams, will not resolve remaining semantic difficulties, nor others that flow from them. But they will enable us to have a meeting of minds and also of hearts enroute.

Religion has been estimated to have well-nigh a thousand definitions. The dictionary terms it, "any system of faith or worship." Whitehead defines it as "what man does with his solitariness." Haydon calls it "cooperative quest for the good life." Cohon explains it as "consciousness of the sacred." Barnes describes it as "the dynamics of social ethics." As basic as any for at least ten of the world faiths of mankind—and for ourselves—might be the simplest and most adequate definition implied in the word itself, for the Latin *religio* means "to bind." Religion thus might be an "attachment to a quest for values—for self, others, and God—as lofty as the love of Deity and as ample as the needs of humanity."

Psychiatry—though just three generations of age and not at all comparable to the millennia of religion—likewise, is meaningful if we explain it in the Greek, from which it derives, for *suxo* suggests "soul" and *iatra* implies "healing." As Dr. Henry E. Kagan once clarified it, "Religion is a spiritual belief; psychiatry is a scientific therapy."

In our day, we are beyond the so-called conflict between science and religion, even as the world has grown beyond Copernican astronomy and sixteenth-century religion. Today psychiatry recognizes the validity of religion in cure of sick-souls while religion values psychotherapy for abnormal emotional sickness, in fears, guilts, loves, hates of even normal people. Both have a common challenge in reducing the threshold of tensions and depressions.

Religion has made peace with astronomy and also with biology, and now even lends a hand in relating all this enrichingly and meaningfully to the saga of life itself—from the seeded sediment of earth to the studded starland pulsars and quasars beyond us and above us. Yet the world within man has gone unseeded and unsolved as yet. We have decoded the atom but have not deciphered Adam! More important than our relationship to distant stars in space or patterns of life in time is our relationship to each other and to ourselves. For several centuries, key words for such progressive relationships were dependence (to a God or a king), independence (for individuals), and interdependence (for nations).

Throughout our life we see increase of tension, fragmentation of familiar patterns, and a volcanic lava-flow of depression in the increase of suicides, in over-crowded mental hospitals, in "juvenile jungles" and their explosive crime waves, in family breakups, in the growth of authoritarianism and "father imagery," in all areas where fear-ridden peoples barter personal liberty for imaginary group security. The vast network of suburbia (as over-night Levittowns), exurbia (as week-end estate-villages) and interurbia (as blends of both along railroads or flight-lines or turnpikes, a continuous settlement from, say, New York City to Washington, D.C.) is in itself a mobility of restlessness, a compulsive obsession for making money, a moving to and fro almost aimlessly for its own sake. Witness Vance Packard's latest volume on the saga of American mobility.

From Freud to Fromm, as in the latter's book *Ye Shall Be As Gods*, we have exemplars of human experience who have crossed the "Great Divide" as often as necessary from the watershed of religion to that of psychiatry in the short span of half a century. Freud began with *Studies in Hysteria* and ended his days with *Moses and Monotheism*. He began with questions about physical therapy and ended with answers about religio-therapy. He "discovered" in man a threefold personality: (1) Instinct or "Un-

conscious"—most important force for energy yet of which man is least conscious or cognizant; (2) Ego—where awareness of the world helps man accept reality; (3) Superego—a kind of "overseer" in the form of conscience, incubated by parents and actuated by subsequent parent-substitutes or subalterns, like teachers, ministers, friends, or relatives. In a parable by Freud, life is a carriage drawn by three horses in tandem: Instinct, Ego, Superego. If their pace is steady, their course normal, their range regular, the journey is free from untoward incident. A healthy individual is one whose ego balances instinct with conscience, with due allowance for both. When instinct overtakes its claim, personality may disintegrate into delinquency, and when conscience may overtax its host with compulsive guilts, personality may fragment into slivers of fear and depression.

Religion as well as psychiatry realizes that emotions affect our bodies, that we often incarcerate emotions which could not grow up with us from childhood and which we repress into the unconscious as we otherwise grow toward maturity, and that such repressed emotions either distill and escape as dreams and phantasies under relaxation of sleep or seek expression by clinging as an invisible creeping vine to some bodily organ. Religion and psychiatry employ a common effort to "ventilate" such inner feeling—through "confession" for one and psychoanalysis for the other. In either instance, cure for repression of emotion is consciously talking to an analyst—or at least, a "listening post."

In this way two great objectives are attained: (1) catharsis—"ventilation" of repressions and relief from tensions; (2) transfer—attachment to the analyst or listener, with a feeling of freedom for complete expression, with full confidence in his competence and without fear of reprisal. In time this process guides the "sick soul" to self-acceptance and freedom from any dependence on others, including the analyst. Even the *Book of Proverbs* has this prescription for mental health: "If there be worry in the heart of man, let one talk it away; yea a goodly word will even make it glad." And the *Book of Psalms* anticipates modern psychiatry when it intimates: "When I kept silence, my bones wore away through my groaning all the day long. Then I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and my iniquity I have not hid. I said I will make confession concerning my transgressions unto the Lord, and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sins." Both *cartharsis* and *transfer* are implied in these outbursts, with God as Supreme Intelligence (in lieu of a secular analyst).

Yet psychiatry has made several notable contributions to religion. Psychiatry restores awareness of the profound insight of religion concerning the therapeutic importance of talking out emotions that trouble our souls. The popular movement of Hasidism for Judaism achieved this very equation for simplicity for the dispirited in soul over 150 years ago in affirmations for life. One, attributed to Rabbi Bunam, insists, "Every human being is to have at least one sincere friend and true companion. This friend must be so close to us that we are able to tell him even that of which we are ashamed." The Tsaddik-Rabbi was indeed such a Father-Confessor to the broken in spirit. This very confidence and guidance were attributed to the Founding Father of Hasidism, the Baal Shem Tov (about 1700-1760), in the story told of him that once when a father came to complain about a dereliction of his son and asked what punishment shall be meted out to this wayward son, the "Master of the Good Name" advised him, "Love him the more!"

Perhaps it would be wise for the ministry in general to have listening as well as speaking pastors. This may not solve serious mental disorders—rightly in the province of medical psychiatry—but it may do much to

relieve emotional strain before it is beyond that, as well as restore a classic function of the minister as a physician of the soul.

As an Einstein beyond Copernicus, so a Fromm beyond a Freud has perceived new dimensions for the world within. The Meningers and Fromms may part company with the Freuds and Adlers, for they concede the validity of ceremony for spiritual as well as emotional stability, the value of personal identity and integrity with rootage in the world, the life of faith in personal tragedy and sorrows of death as synonymous with faith in life. Religion, even more than psychiatry, may have the prescription needed for atomic-age anxiety: faith and love. If life is worth saving and serving, whether by psychiatry or religion or both, it must be for the whole of life rather than for any of its fragments. As psychiatry strives to serve sick souls in their breakdown—as curative medicine—so religion seeks to forestall such sickness in the first place as preventive medicine, with such proven prescriptions as a threefold relationship for fulfillment in God to man, man to God, and man to man. The *Book of Proverbs* synthesizes it all in a simple "prescription for life": "For as one thinketh in his heart, so is he."

**SWORD OF LOYOLA AWARDED TO
MR. AND MRS. FOSTER G. MCGAW,
OF ILLINOIS**

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to some of the great things, some of the fine things that are happening in this wonderful United States. Helping the poor and helping the sick are two of the aims of mankind. The University of Loyola with its sponsorship of the Stritch School of Medicine, has long been a channel for men and women to use in promoting the aims of mankind. In recognition of two of the outstanding citizens of this Nation in the art of helping their fellow man, the University of Loyola has awarded the Sword of Loyola to Mr. and Mrs. Foster G. McGaw of Evanston. To appreciate this recognition, I would like to recite the History of the Sword of Loyola:

HISTORY OF THE SWORD OF LOYOLA

The Sword of Loyola has become a permanent highlight of the Loyola University Stritch School of Medicine Annual Award Dinner. It was conceived in 1964 by Norton F. O'Meara, a former Vice-President of a national advertising company. The Sword is intended to recognize persons of national and international prominence who best typified the distinctive qualities of mind and spirit associated with St. Ignatius of Loyola—Courage, Dedication, and Service.

Inigo (Ignatius) of Loyola was born in the Basque province of Guipuzcoa of Spain. His exact birth date, disputed by historians, is generally accepted as 1491.

A Spanish gentleman, he entered the service of the Duke of Najera who was Viceroy of the border province of Navarre. Not a trained soldier, Inigo was more of an enthusiast ready to raise his sword to defend his king and master. In the war with France in 1521 Inigo received severe leg wounds—wounds which were to change his life and begin a new period in the history of Christianity.

For days he lingered between life and death and sought to pass the time reading the lives of the saints and a life of Christ. Inspired, he made a pilgrimage to the Abbey of Montserrat, near Barcelona, to make a vigil before the altar in the Chapel of Montserrat. At dawn, he laid down his sword and dagger, gave away his fine clothes to a beggar, and donned a sack-cloth robe. In place of his sword, he carried the pilgrim's staff. The conversion was life-long.

After further studies and ordination to the priesthood, he founded the small group which became known as the Society of Jesus. Today, more than 30,000 Jesuits serve society throughout the world as priests, missionaries, authors, and educators.

And from this background, came the Sword of Loyola award, calling attention to those concepts inherent in Ignatius' dedication of his sword to the service of God, and exemplified today in the lives of the following awardees:

1964—J. Edgar Hoover for life-long service to his country in law-enforcement.

1965—Lt. Col. James A. McDivitt, pioneering astronaut, and Maxime A. Faget, engineering genius of the manned space program.

1966—Lt. Dieter Dengler, Viet-Nam prisoner, who escaped through dense jungle to return to the free world.

1967—Brig. General David Sarnoff, recognized for his many contributions to the American communications industry.

1968—Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacher, WW I flying ace and pioneer in commercial aviation.

1969—Dr. Thomas O. Paine, researcher, administrator and Director of N.A.S.A., and William A. Anders, Apollo VII Lunar module pilot on first moon orbiting flight.

1970—Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen, distinguished priest, educator, missionary, and orator.

1971—Miss Helen Hayes, "First Lady of the American Stage," teacher and counselor to aspiring students of the theatre.

1972—Reverend James F. Maguire, S.J., dynamic leader of greatest growth period in the history of Loyola University of Chicago.

1973—Mr. and Mrs. Foster G. McGaw.

I would like to insert into the RECORD Loyola's citation to Mr. and Mrs. Foster G. McGaw:

CITATION

Tonight the prestigious Sword of Loyola for the first time will be presented to a man and wife: Mr. and Mrs. Foster G. McGaw. Since 1964, the Sword of Loyola has been presented annually to a national or international figure who has exhibited to a high degree the beautiful virtues of courage, dedication and service. Foster and Mary McGaw exemplify these qualities to a singular degree.

Mr. McGaw is the honorary chairman of the board of the American Hospital Supply Company which he founded 51 years ago. His vision and unique marketing philosophy are responsible for the hospital supply industry.

To the midwest, however, the name McGaw is rather a synonym for philanthropy. The McGaws' beneficence stems from their belief that they are "the stewards of property that is God's, not their own." Mr. and Mrs. McGaw have built chapels and campus buildings; they have endowed professorships, bestowed matching funds and provided the seed money for many worthwhile projects.

Mr. McGaw's renown in the world of philanthropy gains added eminence from the fact that he rose from humble beginnings. A minister's son, he grew up in a home where money was so scarce that he had to leave high school after his sophomore year and work for two years before he could return and get his diploma.

In 1922, Foster McGaw with the financial support of three other men, founded the American Hospital Supply Company. Today, the company serves our nation's and many

foreign countries' hospitals, stocking more than 70,000 items.

Mary McGaw is a close partner with her husband in all their bequests. Although she prefers to remain in the background, she is a vital force in the partnership-for-giving which she and her husband have formed.

Years ago, Foster and Mary McGaw quietly embarked on a program to enhance the quality of life and opportunity for literally countless men, women and children.

It gives all of us the greatest pleasure to see their goodness rewarded with Loyola University's highest distinction, the Sword of Loyola.

This citation should be an inspiration to all Americans of the good that can be accomplished if you have the desire and the will to serve.

NEARLY 30,000 GATHER AT PRO-LIFE RALLY AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of 30,000 people on a perfect October Sunday in St. Louis was a thrilling testimonial to the joy of life.

This rally was especially significant because it was held at the Old Courthouse, the site where Dred Scott, a slave, was judged to have no human rights because he was someone else's property. The Supreme Court went on to err in this matter also as history reversed the Supreme Court's error and decided in favor of human dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Globe-Democrat summarizing this prolific rally.

NEARLY 30,000 GATHER AT PRO-LIFE RALLY HERE

(By Karen K. Marshall)

Nearly 30,000 persons gathered in downtown St. Louis Sunday to show support for a proposed U.S. constitutional amendment—one to protect the rights of the unborn child.

The crowd—children, nuns, old people, teen-agers, whole families—stretched as far as the eye could see from the western steps of the Old Courthouse and heard two politicians and a doctor tell them they must fight for the rights of the unborn.

Among the speakers were Attorney General John Danforth, who noted that Missouri is challenging the U.S. Supreme Court decision nearly a year ago that struck down abortion laws across the country.

"This is not a hopeless case," Danforth said. "I believe we are making profound arguments," using medical evidence.

If Danforth's case fails, he believes a constitutional amendment (the 28th if the Equal Rights Amendment is ratified by the states) will be necessary.

Danforth said he has had many letters and telegrams warning that he should not speak out against abortion.

"I'm more than an attorney general, I'm a man," Danforth, who is an ordained Episcopalian minister, countered.

"I have my own views, and I believe abortion is wrong," he said. The crowd roared its approval—one of many ovations the speakers heard.

"I am not a Catholic," the attorney general continued. "I am an Episcopalian and I believe that abortion is wrong. This is not a

Catholic issue solely or a Christian issue solely, but a human issue, because what is involved is human life."

Danforth urged the people to educate others and to work for the cause without bitterness. "Let's make our case in a moral and decent and humble way," he said.

Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton (Dem.), Mo., described the abortion issue as a "moral dilemma."

"We must seek to undo by legal means the improvident decision of the Supreme Court," he said.

Eagleton blamed much of that decision on the attitudes of a society that has become "calloused in attitude toward life and death."

"I fear a society," he said "whose highest tribunal comes down on the side of death."

"As a society, we have lost our respect for life in a variety of ways," he said, noting attitudes toward the poor and handicapped, the killings in the war in Southeast Asia and the "inconsistency" of people who favor abortion yet are opposed to death as punishment.

Many people had already been standing in Kiener Memorial Plaza for more than an hour in sunshine that seemed more like June than October when the afternoon's principal speaker finally took the microphone.

But they listened attentively and gave a warm ovation to Dr. Mildred F. Jefferson, a Boston University Medical Center surgeon, who was the principal speaker.

Sunday's Human Life Amendment Rally was part of "one of the greatest people movements our country has known," Dr. Jefferson said.

She insisted that the Supreme Court judges made their decision "as poorly informed citizens," but in doing so, gave women and their doctors "the private right to kill."

"This private right must be denied the woman and doctor or be extended equally to all members of society," she said. "Who should be the one to have it next? The husband who wants to get rid of the mother?" There was no mirth in her voice.

Although the rally officially began at 2:30 p.m., people began assembling about 12:30 at the Soldier's Memorial, 14th and Pine streets, to march to the Old Courthouse. The rally was sponsored by Missouri Citizens for Life.

A SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC SERVICE CAREERS PROGRAM

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, Carbondale, Ill., is the largest city in my congressional district which covers over 11,000 square miles. Since Carbondale is a university town many of its problems have been peculiar in nature because of the phenomenal increase in student enrollment. Among other things this brought on a tremendous housing shortage. My good friend, Mr. Robert Stalls, CDA director, has brought to my attention a very successful public service careers program in Carbondale. In an effort to understand what Model Cities has meant to us I herewith insert a complete résumé of this public service career program in the RECORD.

A SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC SERVICE CAREERS PROGRAM IN CARBONDALE, ILL.

Carbondale, a university town with a total resident and student population of about 45,000, has a classic case of historical neglect in the quadrant of the city which houses the Black population. The neglect is obvious in the physical and environmental abuses—inadequate streets, sewers, storm drains, and sidewalks. It is also obvious in the lack of services, particularly in inadequate protection against open vandalism to public and personal property.

The Model Cities program, which provided a focus for citizen concern about neglect of their neighborhood, generated a tremendous amount of pressure on the city government for two things: improvement in the quality of municipal services to the neighborhood and increased employment opportunities for neighborhood residents in city government. The "Public Service Careers" program provided a way to link these two concerns together by hiring and training Model Neighborhood residents to supplement municipal agency staffs and thereby foster the additional service capacity necessary to bring the level of municipal services in the Model Neighborhood up to the city norm.

In meeting the Model Neighborhood demands for increased employment opportunities, the program's employment statistics would be enough to count the program an overall success. However, the impact of the "Public Service Careers" program has extended beyond that into a far-reaching institutional change of the city's whole personnel system. To date, 46 unemployed or underemployed heads of households in the Carbondale Model Neighborhood have been enrolled in the PSC program. Twenty-eight of those have completed or will shortly complete their training and become full-time city employees. Of the remainder, 11 have voluntarily resigned from the program, 5 have left for better paying jobs, and 7 have been involuntarily terminated from the program. PSC trainees have become permanent city employees in the Public Works Department, the Police Department, the City Planning Agency, the City Manager's Office and recently the Fire Department. This represents a 16.5% reduction in Model Neighborhood unemployment using the base figure for PSC's initial year.

Carbondale's first step to open jobs in its city departments was to do functional analyses of entry level jobs. The object was to identify aptitude and educational achievement levels inclusive of specific skills necessary for a person to do entry level work and to successfully complete the training phase of the general probationary period. These analyses, conducted by the PSC staff and personnel office with the active cooperation and support of the city's administration, revealed educational requirements far in excess of actual need for many entry level jobs. Once the analyses were completed and agreement was obtained from the city departments to employ PSC enrollees, new entry level requirements based on the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) were developed. Unlike others, the WRAT is normed on the achievement levels of disadvantaged populations. Thus, Model Neighborhood residents are scored against norms similar to their own cultural and educational environment. Generally, Carbondale found that WRAT to be a good predictor of on-the-job performance ability while not discriminatory against Blacks who possess the required job aptitude but normally score low on achievement tests.

Following determination of a new entry level WRAT score for a given job, the PSC program advertises widely for applicants from the community. Any applicant eligible for the program can apply for the job and take the WRAT test. Those who score at or above the level required for that particular

job are interviewed by a committee composed of representatives from the departments, the personnel office, the PSC program, and the Model Neighborhood Board. From these interviews, a list of persons qualified for employment is submitted to the department head. So far, the departments always have selected the interviewing committee's top choice.

Once employed, the PSC enrollee receives very personalized counselling and supportive services from the PSC staff along with the on-the-job training necessary for completion of the probationary period. The only difference between the PSC enrollee and normal entry level job holder in the department is that the PSC trainee follows a specific training design as a part of the PSC contract. The PSC program staff has found that inordinate amounts of counselling, motivational stimulation, and supportive services as well as a very personalized follow-up on enrollees account for the success of Carbondale's placement effort. According to George Paluch, the PSC Director, "We have learned that the only effective way to develop individual potential is to convey the attitude: 'We know you can do it. Why not admit to yourself you can do it?' We have learned that we can only provide aggressive supportive services; we can't change a person's performance unless he changes his own internal performance expectations."

Recognition of the importance of motivational stimulation and counselling to successful job adjustment has spilled over into the city's general personnel system. According to the city's past Personnel Director . . . "Innumerable referrals of city employees were made to the PSC Personnel Counselling Unit with respect to finance, problems with supervisors on the job, and other related matters. Many other city employees referred themselves. The city found it almost impossible to have too large a counselling staff." Furthermore, the Director believed "that any entry level careers program must have a strong personnel counselling and advisory service."

Other spin-offs from the PSC program include the institution of parallel training programs for regular city employees who want the opportunity for job upgrading. The initial analysis of employment patterns in the city government which was part of the PSC application identified gross patterns of discrimination against Blacks and women in city agencies. Accordingly, aggressive recruitment for professional level applicants has been undertaken to remedy the underrepresentation. In nine months, the numbers of each category have doubled from two to four women and from four to eight Blacks out of a total number of twenty-nine supervisory and professional positions in the city government. The city personnel office has established a network of communications in twenty-two predominantly Black colleges and feels it has been successful in competing with private industry for qualified graduates.

The critical factor in the success of Carbondale's program is the wholehearted support given to it by the city's past personnel director. According to that director "PSC, being on the outside of our department, . . . put pressure on us to do things that wouldn't have been generated from the inside. I encouraged the program, and when pressure was applied I responded to it, because I fully supported program's objectives." For cities in which the personnel agency doesn't provide this kind of support, it is recommended that individuals or groups file complaints against the cities' personnel systems with the Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC), the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or in federal court under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The chances of success for the complainants in such cases are considerably improved in light of the *Griggs Et Al. v. Duke Power*

Co. 401 U.S. 424 (1971) decision and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. The Griggs decision declares unintentional employment discrimination to be as illegal as the intentional kind. It bans any employment practice by Title VII employers which in effect discriminates "against persons on the basis of race, sex, religion, or national origin . . . unless the employer shows it to be job-related and an accurate indicator of what it seeks to measure." Additionally, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, which extends Title VII coverage to state and local governments, results in the initiation of four new practices. First of all, it expands the jurisdiction of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to include job discrimination complaints by state and local governmental employees. Second, it permits the filing of Title VII discrimination suits in federal court. Third, it allows the U.S. Department of Justice to sue state and local governments for alleged Title VII violations. Finally, it makes federal court decisions mandates for public employers to provide equal employment opportunity for all.

Overall, the PSC program facilitated meaningful progress in employment of Model Neighborhood residents in Carbondale. Consequently, the de facto cancellation of the program by the Department of Labor is a severe disappointment to the CDA as well as the vast majority of the city's administration. That cancellation not only negates the possibility of future gains in employment of the disadvantaged but also places existing ones in grave peril. This is particularly true in view of the city's inability to finance equivalent training on its own and in view of the inability of disadvantaged persons to successfully compete for employment without such training. Nevertheless, in the absence of a PSC program, prior experience, training, and education must against receive primary emphasis in the city's employee selection process. For a very short time, under the PSC, the emphasis on these criteria were secondary and thereby afforded the flexibility necessary for Carbondale to make gains in the employment of minorities. Against this background and motivated by a satisfaction with its achievement, though unavoidably short-term, Carbondale offers its experience with PSC as a lesson to the nation of what can be done to improve minority employment in a climate conducive to change.

In light of its success, it is understandable that the City of Carbondale regrets the untimely cancellation of the PSC program. The sentiments of the CDA, the vast majority of the City Administration, and Model Neighborhood residents are echoed in the current personnel director's observation that "the small gains we were able to make will doubtless be shortly lost." That director labels the Program's cancellation as "extremely regrettable, short-sighted and ill-advised." Finally, again in combination with the CDA, most of the City Administration, and M.N. residents, the Personnel Director "strongly urges continuation of the PSC program by the Congress." For the most part, in Carbondale, PSC was viewed as an excellent beginning toward an ultimate end to the very troublesome problem of minority employment.

Although Carbondale's achievement in this area is most readily attributed in the largest extent to the PSC program, the underlying role of Model Cities was virtually indispensable to that achievement. It was only through a unique use of comprehensive planning and Model Cities money that the PSC program was brought into conformance with the peculiarly local demands of the Carbondale Model Neighborhood. PSC provided for the training but omitted any provision for the payment of trainees salaries. It was Model Cities money that made up for this omission as well as other inadequacies in the categorical PSC program. Thus, in the final analysis, the Carbondale achievement is more accurately

attributable to a combination of thorough comprehensive planning, strategic use of Model Cities' monies, and the PSC program.

CONGRESS: IMPEACH OR FORGET IT

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, during this period of crisis concerning questions of impeachment and resignation, I feel that responsible editorial opinion should be included in the Record. The following article which appeared November 18 in the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., suggests that "Congress must determine if it has the evidence to justify impeachment and then do it and, if not forget it." This thought certainly is indicative of a growing awareness that our country cannot endure a prolonged paralysis, a point which we in the Congress must consider most carefully.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS: IMPEACH OR FORGET IT

In a strange turn of events during recent days, several major newspapers, a few TV commentators and other political observers have called for the resignation of President Nixon as the only means of ending the paralysis in Washington.

Some of these observers have been steadfast Nixon supporters in the past. But the proposed solution is too simple and in fact dangerous.

Certainly the President's ability to lead the nation has been severely damaged by the Watergate scandal and his reluctance to answer questions. But he has said he will not resign.

Those beating the drums of resignation are wrong because they are going outside the Constitution, seeking an illegal solution to end an odorous scandal in the administration, and thereby hoping to bring the seemingly endless investigation to an end.

There are some Republicans, too, who would like to see Nixon resign because he has become a liability for next year's election campaigns. President Nixon's performance in the Watergate battle so far has indeed stretched his credibility nearly to the breaking point.

But the fact remains that the founding fathers of this nation provided the legal means for Congress to remove a President from office who has violated the public trust. That method is impeachment. The House can vote a bill of impeachment. If that happens, the Senate then tries the President and determines guilt or innocence and removal.

Congress, in short, must determine if it has the evidence to justify such an action and then do it. If not, forget it. That does not mean prosecution of others involved in Watergate can not continue.

Trying to force the resignation of a President to avoid the unpleasantness of an impeachment can set a precedent which could make every future President subject to similar attacks by powerful special interest groups and keep the presidency in a constant state of turmoil.

The American people may decide to move to the British parliamentary (vote of confidence) system at some future date to deal with Watergate disasters. But the law of the land now requires impeachment. Congress must either proceed with that course and

soon or drop it and get back to the business of meeting the nation's needs.

RATIONING IS IRRATIONAL

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of every Member an editorial that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of November 15, on the question of gas rationing. I believe this issue demands a perspective not evidenced in much of the rhetoric that has recently abounded on the subject. I insert the editorial so that my colleagues may have a vantage point from which objectively to view this issue with all its consequences and implications; an objectivity that is most necessary in any meaningful evaluation of a national system of gas rationing.

The editorial follows:

RATIONING IS IRRATIONAL

John Love, the President's energy chief, and Rogers Morton, the Interior Secretary, are already predicting that the voluntary conservation program is doomed to failure and that there's no avoiding a full-blown rationing program by early 1974, perhaps New Year's Day. Mr. Nixon insists rationing will only be a last resort, but he doesn't sound very confident.

We certainly hope it doesn't come to that. Rationing is absolutely the worst way to deal with fuel shortages. Any system that can be devised by Washington bureaucrats would have to be based on equal treatment for Americans, within broad priority pigeonholes. And while Americans may be born equal, we doubt there are any two of them with precisely the same legitimate energy requirements. Rationing would impose the grossest kinds of inequities on people and the crudest kinds of inefficiencies on the economy.

Consider: Jones earns \$50,000 a year, commutes to work by train, and owns a Lincoln, a Buick station wagon and a Volkswagen. Smith earns \$8,000 a year, owns a Ford and drives 12 miles to work. Brown makes \$15,000 a year when you add together his earnings, his wife's and his son's, each of whom drives a separate car to work. Miller lives in Brooklyn, rides a subway to work and owns no cars.

So how do you divvy up the rationing coupons? Do you give them out per auto, meaning Jones gets three allotments while Smith gets one? Or do you divvy them up by auto-owning households, which may be fair to Jones but leaves two of the Brown family's wage-earners stranded?

And what about Miller, who after all is the most deserving of all, in terms of patriotically conserving gasoline? Should he not be given gasoline coupons, which after all are worth money? A black market in coupons will evolve slowly at first, but within a minute or two after coupons are first placed in the public's hands it will be going full blast. In fact, one of the options the government is considering is giving out the coupons on a per capita basis, regardless of need, precisely to protect Miller's interests.

If you don't want to hand out the coupons per-car, per-household or per-capita, you can try to distinguish between "essential" and "nonessential" driving. This would require an army of enforcers and also provide further national incentives to lie and cheat. And even without that, Tom, Dick and

Harry, executives who live in the suburbs and drive 15 miles to the city, could form a car pool and divvy up two "essential" allotments for pleasure driving. Or sell their excess coupons to Jones, who wants to drive his Lincoln to Florida.

Insofar as industry is concerned, rationing would also have to be "fair and equitable," as the bureaucrats say. Consider American Widget, which now uses 1,000 units of gasoline, fuel oil and electricity per day. It has to make do with 900 units. The same is true for National Widget. It's all fair and square, except that in the last year American Widget has been scrupulously and patriotically paring energy consumption, turning out the lights, running cold water in the rest rooms, installing more energy-efficient machinery, and recounting delivery schedules. National Widget, on the other hand, has been squandering British thermal units with abandon, as it always has. With rationing, American Widget has no choice but to cut production. National simply trots around doing those things that American already accomplished.

To avoid this and other problems, the government could not make rationing work unless it conducted a national energy audit. Each of several million enterprises would have to come before Mr. Love and his people with several volumes of documents to justify their respective hard-luck stories and win an extra dollop of fuel from the czar.

Rationing worked after a fashion during World War II, but produced no economic distortions to speak of; the economy was wholly geared to the war effort.

Peacetime rationing is quite another matter, and if we're to have it, we had best import several battalions of Soviet bureaucrats who have 56 years of experience in allocating material and only foul up half the time. While rationing seems the fair and equitable thing to the cherubs in Washington who have shown their stuff on wage and price control, in practice we foresee a monumental snafu.

Treasury Secretary Shultz, at least, says rationing will be a "last resort." The first resort, which we recommend begin as of last week if at all possible, is for the government to permit energy suppliers to raise prices until demand meets supply.

TRIBUTE TO MURRY BERGTRAUM

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of sorrow and loss that I pay tribute today to the late Murry Bergtraum of Queens, a former president of the New York City Board of Education, who died on November 8 at the age of 56.

Murry Bergtraum was a major influence in the New York City school system for over 20 years. During that time he was considered one of its most articulate spokesmen on the subject of the improvement of education in New York City. Bergtraum had a distinguished career in the field of educational affairs. His first involvement was as a school parent association president in Queens. It was while serving in this capacity that he became increasingly involved with citywide educational matters. He next became a member and chairman of the local school board of district 25 in Queens.

On May 20, 1969, Bergtraum was appointed by the borough president of Queens as its representative on the five member central board of education. One year later he was chosen by his other four colleagues as president of the board. As president, Bergtraum will be best remembered for his hard work in accomplishing the successful implementation of school decentralization in the New York City school system. Throughout his term as president, Bergtraum held regular meetings with all 32 local board representatives to personally insure that this important policy was being administered properly.

Murry Bergtraum remained actively involved with board matters after his term as president expired in 1971. He served as chairman of the finance and budget committee. Tragically, it was while he was serving in this capacity that he was struck down with his first heart attack in 1972, which caused him to prematurely terminate his distinguished career.

Murry Bergtraum was a rare and remarkable man. In addition to his time-consuming duties on the board of education, he still found time to serve as the executive secretary of the health, pension, and labor funds of the fur industry of New York. In addition, he was a registered public accountant.

The residents of Queens will feel a particular loss over the passing of Murry Bergtraum. He still managed to find time in his hectic schedule to serve his beloved Queens as an officer to several community educational and civic groups, as well as being a trustee of the Queensborough public libraries.

His absence will be felt by all New Yorkers. As a life long resident of the city, and a recipient of a New York City public school education, Bergtraum was able to serve the interest of millions of school children with special sensitivity and awareness of their problems and those of their schools.

It is always an especially tragic loss for New York City when it loses such a sterling public servant as Murry Bergtraum. I know I speak for thousands of my fellow New Yorkers when I express my sincerest condolences to his beloved wife Edith, his three children, Howard, Marcia and Judith, as well as his mother, Mrs. Anna Worth.

It is my fervent hope that the excellent leadership and dedication which Murry Bergtraum gave to the New York City school system will be continued in the future years. There can be no better tribute paid to this fine man.

WHY THE PRESIDENT SHOULD RESIGN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the days since I introduced my resolution calling upon President Nixon to resign and nominate a successor who would be confirmed

under the 25th amendment with the understanding that the President would step aside upon his or her confirmation, it has become increasingly clear that the President's resignation is in the best interest of the country. The President's whirlwind attempts to tell his story before handpicked Members of Congress and friendly audiences are only serving to show how far his credibility has fallen. Even while declaring himself to be candid, he withheld vital information about another missing segment of Watergate tapes from the Republican governors last week. The contradictions, deceptions, and evasions are piling up. As the House begins the impeachment process, it is time for the President to resign.

The President's current position was analyzed yesterday by columnists David Broder and Joseph Kraft in the Washington Post. For those of my colleagues who missed these columns because of the holiday weekend, I place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE WHOLE STORY WILL COME OUT

(By David S. Broder)

The President's frenetic public relations efforts over the past two weeks have served to disguise, but not to alter, the stark seriousness of his situation.

He is fighting for his political life; with the knowledge that the whole story of his role in the transactions that have aroused public suspicion must now emerge. The President has not yet told that story; all he has done, in his meetings with Republican politicians and the press, is to say that it will be told. And in doing that, he is doing no more than acknowledging the obvious. The tough times for him still lie ahead.

For the past month, Mr. Nixon's position has been essentially the same as Spiro Agnew faced when the federal prosecutors in Baltimore last August put him on notice that he was under investigation on serious charges. The Agnew investigation had begun with a host of subsidiary characters, just as the Nixon investigation did. But in both cases, the focus worked its way to the top—and stayed there until the critical questions were resolved.

Agnew was never indicted, and Mr. Nixon may never be impeached, but there can no longer be any doubt in his mind that the whole story will come out. The political imperative which makes full disclosure inevitable in Mr. Nixon's case is the same as in Agnew's: the Republican Party, which nominated both, will not intervene to spare him, any more than it did Agnew, from the burden of full disclosure.

Agnew learned that when a Republican prosecutor, acting with the obvious approval of a Republican Attorney General and a Republican President, filed his formal notice of investigation last August 2.

Mr. Nixon received the same word from Republican congressional leaders on Oct. 23, the Tuesday after the long holiday weekend on which Cox, Richardson and Ruckelshaus were eliminated. The President's emissaries went up to Capitol Hill that day to line up Republican support against impeachment demands. They were told, and bluntly, that no Republican leader would speak up on his behalf unless the President was prepared to come clean.

The first step in coming clean, Mr. Nixon was told, would be to turn over the White House tapes. That afternoon, two hours after the ultimatum had come from the Republicans on Capitol Hill, the President abandoned his three-month fight to withhold the tapes.

Even should Mr. Nixon now desire to back-track and stop short of full disclosure, the pressures pushing in that direction appear

irreversible. Every passing day brings the House Republicans one day closer to their day of reckoning with their constituents. To support the President against impeachment, they will require of him complete candor.

The new independent prosecutor, starting from the base Archibald Cox left behind, is moving toward indictments of some of Mr. Nixon's principal past associates. The Senate Watergate committee is approaching the deadline for rendering its judgment on the matters it has been investigating.

Any effort, however mild, by Mr. Nixon to interfere in these processes will come at high cost to his own depleted reserves of trust. Every additional foot of tape declared nonexistent or inaudible comes out of his hide. He has already conceded about 90 per cent of the ground he set out to protect last spring, when Watergate broke. He cannot retreat much farther without literally being backed out of the Oval Office.

The proposition now for him is quite simple: Can he stand to come clean? If he can—if he can establish that he did not permit or direct the concealment my members of his campaign organization and White House staff of the Watergate crimes; if his role in the milk producers case, the ITT case, and the campaign contributions cases was, indeed, innocent; if the handling of his personal finances has been in every respect above-board—then full disclosure will enable him to rout his critics and restore his credibility and power.

If, on the other hand, he cannot stand scrutiny, then he will be driven from office, as surely as Agnew was.

A reporter covering this story is the last one who should prejudice its final chapter. But certain ominous parallels are becoming obvious. Agnew lasted a little more than nine weeks after he knew he would have to come clean. He employed various tactics in that period, first pledging cooperation in the investigation, then finding reasons to delay turning over evidence, waging war with his critics in the press and government, and finally "going public" to mobilize sympathy for his stand.

In retrospect, we can see that those were the writhings of an impaled creature. Agnew was dancing at the end of a rope.

We do not know if Mr. Nixon's situation is as desperate, but his tactics this past month have been exactly those Agnew employed in his final weeks in office. Now, like Agnew, he has come finally to face the realization that it will all come out. He knows what that means for him. We will soon enough know, too.

TOWARD IMPEACHMENT

(By Joseph Kraft)

"People have a right to know whether or not their President is a crook." Mr. Nixon said the other day. But how are we going to find out?

Not certainly from the series of personal appearances the President has been making in what the White House is pleased to call "Operation Candor." Mr. Nixon, in fact, is one of the least trustworthy witnesses on his own behalf.

For better or worse—and it is not always for the worst—Mr. Nixon has in his makeup far less psychological space for failure than most men. When things get tough he fights back, and when they go wrong he tends to blame others. Hence, his recent contretemps with former Atty Gen. Elliot Richardson about the firing of special Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox.

Mr. Richardson is a man prone to present controversial points in highly abstract formulations. Those formulations are often obscure in their meaning, and few men are less well-equipped to divine their sense than the unsubtle soldier who now serves as the White House chief of staff, Gen. Alexander

Haig. So it is entirely possible that Gen. Haig did not understand Mr. Richardson when serving as his pipeline to the President.

But the President and Gen. Haig could not admit such weaknesses. Instead they implied that Richardson lied. They intimated he was a drunk. They even hinted that a fair system—as distinct from one rigged to get Mr. Nixon—would have Richardson up on perjury charges.

If we cannot expect to get the beginning of what we need to know from Mr. Nixon, there are also limitations on the investigations being conducted by the special Senate committee and the Watergate prosecutor. The Senate committee is limited in its jurisdiction. It has to stick to matters relevant to the presidential campaign, which means it cannot go into such clearly important transactions as the President's tax returns or the payments made on his homes in Key Biscayne and San Clemente.

As to the special prosecutor, there is no reason to disparage Mr. Cox's replacement, Leon Jaworski. He has already shown in his handling of the case involving the White House plumbers that he is not going to be snowed just because the White House yells "national security."

Even so, Mr. Jaworski also has limitations. In particular, he has no mandate to investigate such matters as the Rebozo case and the President's taxes and homes.

An impeachment proceeding knows no such bounds. The House Judiciary Committee, to which the impeachment resolutions have been referred, is setting up to go into an across-the-board investigation of Mr. Nixon and his conduct as President. It will center not on any particular issue or offense, but on the larger question of whether Mr. Nixon abused the public trust which is the root of legitimacy in our country.

The organization of this inquiry is necessarily going to be an extremely difficult and messy operation. The Judiciary Committee has 38 members broken into factions. Its chairman, Peter Rodino of New Jersey, is new in the job, and its ranking minority member, Edward Hutchinson of Michigan, lacks the bipartisan approach of his predecessor, William McCulloch of Ohio, which made the committee so effective in the past. A great deal will have to devolve on the general counsel and his staff and on the selection of a special subcommittee that will actually conduct the investigation.

Even if all these arrangements go beautifully, no one should imagine that the hearings can be short or neat, or that there will emerge a particular set of facts that bear the Perry Mason stamp of being the Truth. On the contrary, the hearings are probably going to be full of partisan rancor. They will wrack the country and they will probably arrive only at a general judgment as to whether or not Mr. Nixon betrayed his trust.

For all these reasons, other methods would probably have been preferable.

It would still be better if Mr. Nixon, on the confirmation of Gerald Ford to be Vice President, resigned. But failing that there is no alternative. For bad as it may be, there is one thing worse for the country than impeachment. That would be to sweep under the rug the issue which has now been posed—the issue of whether, in the large moral and intellectual sense, the President is a crook.

UPDATE ON VIETNAM

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the

San Jose Mercury, November 6, 1973, summarizes recent and projected future events in Vietnam, drawing a not very optimistic but probably realistic picture of the current situation. The article then goes on to call attention to the other problems that now beset us here at home: the Watergate, the energy crisis, the Middle East war. I agree with the Mercury that it is most fortunate that we no longer have the Vietnam war to add to our list of difficulties, and that we should remain as disentangled as possible from the tragedy of involvement in Southeast Asia.

The editorial follows:

NO RETURN TO VIETNAM

While the attention of the American people has been riveted on the Middle East and assorted domestic crises, a fragile, unstable peace has continued to crumble in Southeast Asia.

Now, heavy armor and artillery clashes between North and South Vietnamese forces near the Cambodian border provide a warning of perhaps grimmer things to come. The lessons both for Saigon and Washington in this are clearly obvious.

Saigon had better know—and accept the fact—that it will sink or swim on its own efforts. Washington, for its part, is most unlikely to commit any major forces to salvage a South Vietnamese regime which cannot, or will not, fight for its own independence.

Despite the cease-fire signed last January, there is little question that North Vietnam intends to press its effort to take over all of Indochina by force. The cease-fire did not, for example, prevent Hanoi from continuing its war against the Lon Nol regime in Cambodia; indeed, the fighting tended to step up in Cambodia in direct proportion to its waning in South Vietnam.

Now that Hanoi apparently believes its Cambodia supply route is secure once more, it is beginning to turn its attention again to South Vietnam. Armor is on the move; artillery duels are breaking the uneasy truce. Hanoi will, if it follows past practice, push ahead as far and as fast as it can. If it is stopped, Saigon will have to stop it. Washington won't.

The United States, which is to say the vast majority of the American people, views war in Southeast Asia as a nightmare from which it has recently awakened and to which it is resolved never to return.

Apart from unhappy memories in Southeast Asia, the American people are confronted with what most of them consider to be more serious problems closer to home. The fourth Arab-Israeli war produced the most recent and potentially the most disastrous confrontation yet between the United States and the Soviet Union, a confrontation that continues to lie just below the surface of diplomatic negotiations to bring peace and stability to the Middle East.

In addition to, though not actually in consequence of, the Arab-Israeli war, the oil-producing Arab states have slapped an embargo on oil to the United States and cut back production by 25 per cent. Deliveries to America's allies in Western Europe have been reduced, in part to put indirect pressure on the United States and in greater part to force crude oil prices higher still.

All of which will add marginally to the energy crisis in the United States in the short run and create diplomatic headaches for Washington in the long run.

Add to this the continuing crises of inflation and the near-paralysis of government because of the ongoing Watergate scandal, and the total picture is one of a Washington determined to remain out of any foreign difficulty it has managed to put behind it. And that means Vietnam first and foremost.

CAMPAIGN TO REMOVE THE EARNINGS LIMITATION ON SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to inform my colleagues that Alan Courtney of WIOD Radio in Miami, Fla., which serves the 12th District of Florida which I represent in the 93d Congress, has initiated a nationwide petition addressed to all Members of Congress to gain support for legislation to remove the earnings limitation on social security recipients.

Mr. Courtney hopes to start a national drive to send signed petitions to the Committee on Ways and Means to verify the grass roots support for this legislation by those receiving social security benefits living in Florida and throughout the Nation.

Since coming to the U.S. Congress in 1966, I have introduced legislation in each Congress, the 90th, 91st, 92d, and 93d, calling for complete removal of the earnings limitation on social security recipients. In my opinion, the present law is harsh and unrealistic, and its removal would ease the financial plight of all elderly Americans. However, while there have been several modifications of the earnings limitation, the Committee on Ways and Means which has jurisdiction over this matter in the House of Representatives has not seen fit to act favorably on the complete removal of this bar on social security payments.

When the social security law was being written in the 1930's, the authors wanted it to be a social insurance system under which workers and their dependents were insured against the loss of work income resulting from the worker's death, disability, or retirement. To this end, the authors felt it was desirable to be sure a person was retired before he was given social security benefits. The original intent of the retirement test or earnings limitation was to prevent senior citizens from working and at the same time collecting social security, on the theory that they could afford to work cheaper than other workers because in effect they were being subsidized. In addition, it was hoped that early retirement would create jobs for the unemployed younger people.

The present retirement test contains four elements:

- First, the annual exempt amount—\$2,100 goes to \$2,400 January 1, 1974;
- Second, the reduction mechanism—\$1 for each \$2 of earnings above \$2,100;
- Third, the monthly measure of retirement—\$175;
- Fourth, exempt age—72 and over.

We should stop treating elderly Americans like dependent children and permit them to assume more responsibility for their financial future if they so chose.

The present earnings limit on income applies only to the income received from working. Benefits, however, are payable regardless of income from investments or other nonwork sources such as savings,

investments, insurance, and the like. Thus as it stands now, those who support the earnings limitation argue that to allow unlimited income from working would: First, violate the basic principle of the system; second, help only a very few people; and, third, would add substantial costs to the present program.

It is my view, however, that since social security benefits are related to the wages of both the employer and the employee contributor and his contributions to the social security fund, it should be a matter of right for any person if he chooses to receive benefits for his contributions when he reaches the minimum retirement age. Today we are supplementing the income of the prosperous persons who have pensions, insurance and investments, while we are penalizing the less fortunate who have for one reason or another little or no resources to fall back on in their later years, and who must therefore work in order to make ends meet under today's conditions. The policy of discouraging older workers from working past an arbitrary retirement age originated as I indicated during the depression when it was necessary to increase job opportunities for younger workers, but today's high-employment economy does not require such restrictive measures.

In truth, why should we insist that a person reaching 65 years old should retire and leave the work force. Many have skills and experience which are needed and which increase productivity. Moreover, the Federal Government, gerontologists, and others concerned with the health of the elderly, encourage the hiring and retention of older workers in all aspects of the economy.

The earnings limitation is out-of-date. It was designed for a bygone era, and its effects are contrary to the original purposes of social security insurance to provide an income floor for elderly Americans. It causes hardship to our elderly Americans who must augment the income by working and it should be stopped.

If we assume that most of the 3 million workers over 65 are entitled to the average social security retirement benefit of \$163.70 monthly, and we know that the older worker cannot expect to earn equal wages to those paid younger people, let us take the example of an elderly American earning \$4,500 per year. His net earning from employment paid at this rate is \$3,300 and the loss in income of \$1,200 represents an effective tax rate of over 36 percent. In the schedule of Federal personal income taxes, such a rate applies to incomes over 20 times as great.

I congratulate Alan Courtney of Miami's WIOD for his dedication in this matter. I hope others will join in his efforts to precipitate action to remove of the earnings limitation by getting people to sign their names to petitions and forward them to either Alan Courtney, WIOD Radio, Miami, Fla., or to the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

The petition being circulated by Mr. Alan Courtney is as follows:

PETITION TO U.S. CONGRESS

We, the undersigned petition Congress to amend title 2 under Social Security Act to permit an individual receiving benefits thereunder to earn outside income without losing any of such benefits.

Please sign below, when page is filled, mail to Alan Courtney, WIOD, Miami, Florida 33138.

Name—Address—City—State:

NEW ENGLAND NEEDS YEAR-ROUND DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a statement by David Bartley, speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives in support of year-round daylight saving time.

Those of us from the New England States are especially concerned about the energy crisis, because it will most dramatically affect our region. We face an energy crisis of ever-increasing magnitude as predictions continue to point toward greater shortages of oil, the form of energy upon which New England depends highly for heating our homes and for generating electricity to light our homes.

There is evidence that year-round daylight saving time will save a significant percentage of our energy needs this winter. Mr. Bartley has graphically spelled out the merits and need for enacting year-round daylight saving time, as one important, immediate response to the energy deficit and as one key method of energy conservation.

I ask unanimous consent that the following remarks be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I am David M. Bartley, speaker of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I will speak in favor of Senate bills 1260, 2568 and 2602, all of which provide for the extension of daylight saving time through the winter months.

Title 15, section 260, sub (A) of the U.S. Code recognizes the right of an individual State to unilaterally exempt itself from daylight saving time. Yet, subsection (B) has the effect of specifically prohibiting States from doing the converse. At the present time, there are several States in our country which do not observe daylight saving time at all; and only (Indiana) observes it in selected counties. Thusly, the Uniform Time Act of 1966 notwithstanding, time in the United States is not uniform.

There is nothing sacred about standard time. Throughout the world, there are countries which add 15, 30 or even 45 minutes to the "standard" time of their respective zones.

Precedents have been set for year-round daylight saving time—principally during the two world wars. The Congress and Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt responded at that time to the need for an extra hour of afternoon daylight. Parts of Europe turned their clocks ahead two hours during both wars. (England had success with year-round daylight saving time between 1968 and 1971?) (But gave it up because of northern farmer opposition).

As a result of the favorable experience of year-round daylight saving time in World War I, Massachusetts, with no federal guidelines, passed legislation in 1920 to advance the clock one hour between March and October. The dates were changed twice until, in 1954, we observed daylight saving time from April to October. More than ten years before the federal government acted in 1966, all the states in the Northeast had unilaterally passed uniform laws for changing their times.

Today, we in the Northeast face an energy crisis of ever increasing magnitude. Every day our newspapers predict greater and greater shortages of oil, a form of energy on which New England is highly dependent. The world and national political situation is fraught with uncertainty.

Some positive action is needed. Information filtering through the media from the private utility companies' advertisements indicates that any measure that will save even small amounts of energy should be implemented. Recommended courses of action range from lowering thermostats a few degrees to closing our schools for the full month of January.

Surely turning our clocks ahead one hour is less inconvenient than these other alternatives.

There is, I believe convincing evidence that adoption of year-round daylight saving time will save a small, though significant, percentage of our energy needs this winter.

Peak usage of electricity occurs at dusk. Daylight saving time during the winter months would dissipate this peak usage, which is very inefficient and therefore more costly to produce than the same number of kilowatts at other times of the day.

Thus, even though our mornings would be darker, the total use of electricity would decrease—some experts believe by as much as two percent.

In World War II, the Office of Production Management estimated that year-round daylight saving time saved almost 1% of our electrical requirements.

Much of our electricity in the Commonwealth is generated by oil. Boston Edison, our largest electrical utility, has told me they would save 30 to 50 thousand barrels of oil this winter if this program were adopted. This constitutes approximately one day's quota.

Aside from its absolute energy conservation, potential the extension of daylight saving time would have important ancillary effects:

The average commuter would be traveling during the daylight in the evenings. The occurrence of motor vehicle traffic accidents at dusk is more than twice that of the morning hours.

School children would have the advantage of an extra hour of daylight in the afternoon for leisure and school activities. They would be twice as safe as waiting for a morning bus in semi-darkness as they are now in the afternoon. Child molestation may decrease.

Not the least of all, the average citizen would enjoy a later sunset. The public response to my office on this issue has been overwhelmingly favorable. The Boston Globe and our NBC affiliate radio station have editorialized in favor. Last year, even *Time* magazine endorsed this measure.

The New England Regional Commission, in a study completed last week of the New England States' response to the energy deficit, recommended year-round daylight saving time as a key method of energy conservation.

Mr. Chairman, the Massachusetts House is convinced of the merits of this proposal. Last week, the chairman of our committee on government regulations, Rep. Robert B.

Ambler, drafted a bill to put Massachusetts on daylight saving time indefinitely, effective December 1 of this year. Last Thursday, this bill passed our 240 member house by an overwhelming vote of 215 to 7.

Two weeks ago, I asked our Republican Governor, Francis W. Sargent, to call an emergency meeting of the New England Governor's Conference to consider regional action on this proposal. His response has been to put this matter on the agenda of their next regularly scheduled meeting of November 15.

I have personally contacted other New England State legislatures on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, New England can not afford to waste time at this late date. Some of our people have already been denied oil deliveries; some contracts for schools and government oil needs have not received one bid.

We are mindful that unilateral action on our part would be illegal unless you change the U.S. Code by means of the bills before you today.

Yet, it has been our experience lately that New England must speak out to a disproportionate degree in order for the present administration to respond to our plight.

The Massachusetts House has gone on record in favor of a positive, painless way to lessen the impact of the impending energy shortage.

I am hopeful that the Congress, under your initiative and guidance will do the same.

Thank you.

THE MANCHESTER, N.H., FEDERAL BUILDING—EXAMPLE OF GSA FORESIGHTEDNESS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are now beginning to become aware of this country's energy problems. But this awareness has been long in coming. The present reaction to our energy crisis is heartening, but it is even more encouraging to know of actions already undertaken; actions which anticipated the current crisis, and actions which offer the immediate prospect of saving great amounts of energy.

I want to call attention to an example of this kind of advanced planning. The General Services Administration is currently designing a Federal Office Building for Manchester, N.H. Over a year ago, Arthur F. Sampson, Administrator of General Services, designated this project as an energy conservation test project. It will be a living laboratory to test both recognized and totally new concepts of energy conservation in building construction and use.

It is expected that this building will use 25 to 35 percent less energy than a conventional building—at no substantial increase in cost. The building will be wired with instruments to test the energy savings made and the results will be made public. In this way, the building will serve as a model for energy conservation for all future buildings.

The possibilities this building offers for future energy conservation programs are challenging and fascinating.

The November 10, 1973, issue of *Business Week* magazine carried an excellent summary of GSA's expectations for the building. This important project is deserving of continued close attention in this period of energy conservation.

The article follows:

THIS BUILDING SAVES ENERGY

"We waste so much energy in buildings now that even by thinking about it, we can effect major savings," says Walter A. Meisen of the General Services Administration. As assistant commissioner of the Office of Construction Management, Meisen is now putting taxpayer's money where his mouth is. For the past six months, he has been supervising the design of a unique office building that will incorporate virtually every energy-saving device in existence.

The GSA's test project is the seven-story Federal Office Building to be built in Manchester, N.H., for the local branches of 11 federal agencies. The design is now 90% complete, and bids will be let in the spring. When the first of 500 workers moves in two years later, they will find a building that should use only three-quarters to one-half of the energy of a conventional building of the same size.

Not only will such elements as the heating and cooling systems be as efficient as possible, but the shape of the building, the colors of the walls, and even the temperature of the water in the washrooms will be carefully related to energy use. "Our initial expectation was a 20% to 25% saving," Meisen says, "and we fully expect to exceed that."

EXHIBIT A

The decision to use the Manchester building as an energy laboratory was made by GSA Commissioner Arthur F. Sampson after his agency and the National Bureau of Standards sponsored a conference on energy conservation in May, 1972. The \$6.5-million building had already been funded, and GSA had hired Nicholas Isaak & Andrew Isaak, an architectural firm in Manchester, to design the project. After Sampson's decision, Dublin-Mindell-Bloome Associates, a New York City engineering firm, which had been an active member of the energy conference, was named as energy consultant.

"Our first job was to solicit all the ideas we could," says Alfred S. Dublin, president of the firm. "We wrote to utility companies, manufacturers, designers, universities, some foreign groups, anybody we could think of." The result was a pile of about 500 suggestions ranging from the facetious—one man said the entire building should be edible—to the feasible. The Dublin firm also went through details of 7,000 of its earlier projects, looking for energy-saving ideas.

Conforming to the GSA's proviso that components and materials must be available off the shelf, the consultants chose a short list of elements that seemed likely to be useful. These were fed into an NBS computer to evaluate their potential for saving energy both in the operation of the building and in the production of the components themselves.

A BLOCKHOUSE

Though the final design is not yet complete, it is already clear what the building will look like. Outwardly, it will be as square as the site permits, to get maximum volume with minimum exposure of wall areas to the weather. The north wall will be heavily insulated, at least 12 in. thick, dark in color, and windowless. All these characteristics are designed to conserve heat, which Dublin

estimates would take 56% of the energy utilized in a building of similar size and type in New Hampshire's cool climate.

For the same reason, windows on five of the floors will fill only 10% of the outside area, compared with the usual figure of about 50% in office buildings. They may be of special reflecting glass, and they will probably be mounted in niches at right angles to the walls, and be protected from summer sun by louvers or fins outside the building. The angles of the fins and the windows themselves will be calculated to accept the winter rays to pick up as much natural warmth as possible.

On one floor, however, windows will probably make up 90% of the outside area, a variation that reflects one of the many dilemmas faced by the designers. "Is it better to save on lighting costs with big windows, which then create a heating and cooling problem? Or should we cut down on window area and use more lighting—which can create a heating problem?" asks architect Nicholas Isaak. The different arrangements are an attempt to find the answer.

Lighting, in fact, which uses about a quarter of a building's energy, will be one of the most visible changes. Instead of rows of fixtures that give uniform illumination everywhere, areas will be lit selectively. Corridors and lobbies will be left dimmer than stairs, for example, and desks and other work areas will be more brightly lit. Some desks will have individual, library-style lights.

HEATING AND COOLING

GSA and Dublin have concentrated much of their own energy on the heating and cooling systems. There will be variable-flow, rather than variable-temperature, heating. When a man is cold in a conventional building, he usually gets someone to turn up a thermostat, which results in the delivery of hotter air. In the Manchester building, such an adjustment will increase the flow of warm air, but the air will be at the same temperature. A worker will feel warmer, but the costly business of heating all the air for the sake of one person or a limited area will be avoided.

Excess heat and cold will also be stored for later use. When part of the building has to be cooled, the unwanted heat will be stored as hot water in one of three 10,000-gal. tanks under the building. Excess heat from light fixtures will be conserved in the same way, and so will unneeded cold air. In most conventional buildings, hot and cold air that is not needed immediately is wasted by being ejected into the open air.

Even hot water for handwashing, which consumes only about 3% of an office building's energy, has drawn the attention of the designers. "Normal systems heat the water to about 140F," says Dublin. "Then it runs all through the pipes, losing heat, and is eventually cooled to about 100F with cold water by the person using it." Water in the Manchester building will therefore be heated initially to only 100F.

Finally, the building will be made even less dependent on normal fuels by having two or three solar collectors of different types mounted on the roof. These will be virtually the only custom-made items used.

All these measures are expected to cut energy use drastically. Dublin claims that GSA's estimates of 20% to 25% savings are far too modest. His firm's computerized simulation shows that a conventional building of the same type would use about 135,000 Btu per sq. ft., per year, compared with only 56,000 Btu for the newly designed building, a dramatic energy saving of 58%.

Whether this is borne out in the actual building is still in question, but the National Bureau of Standards plans to monitor the results for at least five years to find out.

WHY NOT USE AGRIPOWER TO COMBAT OIL POWER?

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, in the Monday, November 19, issue of the Chicago Tribune, the distinguished consulting economist, Eliot Janeway, presents an accurate and persuasive account of the causes and remedies for the current energy crisis.

Mr. Janeway rightly points out that we should take the initiative away from the Arab officials and deal with them on a quid pro quo trading basis, that is, if they give us the oil we need, we will give them the food they require.

If they think that they can dictate our foreign and domestic policy by virtue of their mere control of necessary fuel reserves, these countries will have to seriously reconsider such a position. Americans throughout history have stood up to adversity and overcome all odds.

I concur with Mr. Janeway in his well-founded belief that "agripower" is much stronger than their oil power. We should use our "agripower" to counter their threats.

Most importantly, all other nations of the world that are on the so-called blacklist of the Arab countries and that are threatened with oil cutoffs unless they bow to Arab blackmail, and, as a result, break off diplomatic relations and stop their support of the young State of Israel should unite and halt agricultural exports to these same Arab nations.

Because Mr. Janeway took this issue as the thesis for his excellent article, I would ask that those comments be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRIPOWER: ANSWER TO ARAB BLACKMAIL

(By Eliot Janeway)

New York, November 18.—Gas rationing is on its way. Worse still, it is being taken for granted as the way to cope with the artificial shortage that has been created.

The thinking which accepts gas rationing as an American answer to the crisis is an extension of the thinking which invited the crisis to explode in the first place. Playing American's hand by rules made to suit the opposition is its expectation.

Accepting the necessity of a costly American adjustment to harsh terms laid down by unfriendly countries is the underlying strategy of this thinking, even though each and every one of the unfriendly countries is less favorably situated than America and brandishes less bargaining power.

Rationing consumption is not the only way to balance the world market equation. It's only one of two ways to do it. Renewing the flow of supply is the other, and better way.

The Broadway comedy "The Solid Gold Cadillac" left the language enriched with a phrase which puts the problem of distinguishing between the two methods: "I don't get ulcers" the tycoon hero snorts, "I give them." America has acquiesced in the Arabs' seizing of the ulcer-giving lead role. She has accepted the ulcer-getting role of stooge.

Henry Kissinger's travels are exposing three fictions about the Arabs as ulcer-givers. The first is that they are united. The

second is that having oil makes them strong. The third is that holding back shows their self-sufficiency.

Seeing thru all three fictions suggests as many techniques for Uncle Sam to use in switching to the ulcer-giving role and coming on hard playing it.

Exploiting the divisions among the petropowers is the most obvious way. Israeli strategy has been playing this game for years by offering to pay interest on private dealings with the rich Arabs, in defiance of Moslem law, and leaving them worried about whether the poor Arabs might find out about it.

Greed is the companion motive to fear. It's not as if all the Arabs were cutting off all their oil. Nor is it as if all of them were not eyeing the others to see who is sacrificing how much and who may be working out a special deal for how much more.

What's wrong with Washington dangle some marketing payola before the petro-producers—one at a time? The Europeans and the Japanese would scramble onto any American bandwagon that rolled across the Middle East oil country recording the success of Washington's divide and rule tactic.

The second fiction about the Arabs is that having oil makes them strong. The reality is that having nothing but oil makes them weak. Having dollars to show for their oil makes them vulnerable to Washington's retaliation against their oil holdback.

Blocking dollars of unfriendly oil powers would be a daring response to their oil blackmail. It would also be profitable because it would drive the world oil price back down.

America did not fire the shot that started the new world trade war. But this reply would be the shot that ends it.

A constructive course for America to take is to play the agripower hand—no oil, no food, and lots of food for lots of oil. Activating agripower would destroy the myth of petro-power self-sufficiency.

Agriculture Secretary Earl Buttz' latest alibi for inaction argues that the Russians would make up for any Arab food deficiency. But they can't handle their own food deficiency.

Arab food requirements, meanwhile, are soaring with their dollar flows. The Arabs are now the biggest new entries into the world meat market, and they have the money to pay for it. American agripower is the most wholesome new force for peace in the history of this war-weary world—if only Washington will mobilize it.

GALLUP POLL REFLECTS OVERWHELMING PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR WAR POWERS ACT

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring—but certainly not surprising—to know that when the Congress voted on November 7 to override the President's veto of the war powers resolution, House Joint Resolution 542, it was clearly reflecting the overwhelming support of the American people.

That fact was amply demonstrated in a public opinion survey recently conducted by the Gallup poll, the results of which were released on November 18.

What that nationwide survey reflected was an 80-percent margin of pub-

lic support for curbing the President's warmaking powers. In other words, 4 out of 5 Americans responded favorably to the question:

Do you think the President should or should not be required to get the approval of Congress before sending U.S. armed forces into action outside the U.S.?

As chief sponsor of the legislation in the House I have long been convinced of such widespread public endorsement. Surely the 284 Members of the House and the 75 Members of the Senate who voted to override will take satisfaction from knowing that they were voting the best interests and views of their constituents.

I am pleased to place in the RECORD at this point the Gallup poll released on the survey as well as a related New York Times article of November 18 and recommend them to the reading of my colleagues.

PUBLIC OVERWHELMINGLY VOTES IN FAVOR OF LIMITING PRESIDENT'S WAR-MAKING POWERS
(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., Nov. 17.—The American people overwhelmingly support, in principle, the new war powers bill which would require that a President receive congressional approval before sending U.S. troops into action overseas.

By a vote of 5 to 1, the public favors curbing the President's war-making powers. Under the new bill, the President would have to explain an act of war within 48 hours, but even if Congress didn't accept his reasons, the chief executive could continue the fighting for 60 days and have an additional 30 days to complete withdrawal from the action.

In overriding President Nixon's veto, the House voted 285 to 135, four votes more than the two-thirds majority required to override a veto. The subsequent vote in the Senate, 75 to 18, made the bill law with 13 votes more than required.

VIETNAM WAR A KEY FACTOR

A key factor in the public's desire to limit the war-making powers of the President is their desire to avoid future Vietnams. As early as 1966, six in 10 held the view that we should not send troops if a situation like Vietnam were to arise in another part of the world.

A nationwide Gallup survey conducted in late April this year showed that the public, by an overwhelming majority, wanted congressional sanction of further military action in Southeast Asia. The same survey showed Americans opposed to the bombing in Cambodia and Laos by a 2 to 1 margin, with a large majority holding the view that bombing would lead to a reinvolvement of American troops in Southeast Asia.

In addition, more recent surveys have shown that the vast majority of Americans would be opposed to a commitment of U.S. forces if the Middle East situation were to flare up again.

ALL GROUPS FAVOR LIMITING POWER TO WAGE WAR

The view that the President should get congressional approval before committing the nation to war is held by a large majority of persons in all major population groups.

Women, Democrats and younger persons are the most likely to favor limiting the chief executive's war-making powers.

Following is the question asked and the key findings:

"Do you think the President should or should not be required to get the approval

of Congress before sending U.S. armed forces into action outside the U.S.?"

[In percent]

	Should	Should not	No opinion
Nationwide.....	80	16	4
Men.....	76	20	4
Women.....	85	11	4
18 to 29 years.....	84	12	4
30 to 49 years.....	78	17	5
50 years and older.....	79	17	4
Republicans.....	71	26	3
Democrats.....	86	10	4
Independents.....	80	17	3
College background.....	77	19	4
High school.....	83	14	3
Grade school.....	78	15	7
East.....	80	17	3
Midwest.....	84	13	3
South.....	76	17	7
West.....	80	16	4

Although an overwhelming majority of Americans favor approval by Congress before the President commits U.S. armed forces to action, six in 10 persons think Congress should not be required to obtain the approval of the people by means of a national vote. At the same time, however, as many as one-third would favor such a procedure.

The question of a war referendum was asked of a sample of the U.S. public by the Gallup Poll at regular intervals during the late 1930's and early 1940's. Majorities consistently opposed a referendum until just before the outbreak of World War II when opinion shifted in favor.

A majority of persons in all segments of the population are opposed to a national vote, with the exception of young adults and persons with a grade school background where the issue is fairly evenly divided.

Following is the question and findings:
"In order to declare war, should Congress be required to obtain the approval of the people by means of a national vote?"

[In percent]

	Should	Should not	No opinion
Nationwide.....	35	58	7
Men.....	31	64	5
Women.....	39	52	9
18 to 20 years.....	49	46	5
21 to 30 years.....	27	67	6
31 to 40 years.....	33	58	9
41 years and older.....	21	72	7
Republicans.....	42	51	7
Democrats.....	35	59	6
Independents.....	25	74	1
College background.....	37	57	6
High school.....	43	40	17
Grade school.....	38	57	5
East.....	32	60	8
Midwest.....	37	54	9
South.....	33	63	4
West.....	33	63	4

The results reported today are based on a nationwide survey conducted Nov. 2-5 with 1,550 adults, 18 and older, interviewed in person in more than 300 scientifically selected localities across the nation.

**[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 1973]
EIGHTY PERCENT IN POLL SUPPORT WAR-POWERS CURB ON THE PRESIDENCY**

Four out of five Americans support in principle the new war-powers law enacted by Congress Nov. 7 over President Nixon's veto, the Gallup Poll organization said yesterday.

The law is aimed at limiting the President's power to commit the armed forces to hostilities abroad without Congressional approval. It sets deadlines of up to 90 days for

troop commitments by the President alone and gives Congress the right to step in and order immediate removal of troops by passage of a concurrent resolution.

The Gallup organization said the view that the President should be required to get Congressional approval before sending United States armed forces into action outside this country was held by a large majority in all population groups, but women, Democrats and younger persons were most likely to favor it.

Nationwide, 80 per cent of those questioned in a survey Nov. 2-5 said that the President should be required to get the approval of Congress in such circumstances. Sixteen per cent thought he should not be required to get Congressional approval. Four per cent had no opinion.

Although 85 per cent of the women questioned thought he should be required to obtain Congressional approval, the proportion of men who thought so was 76 per cent. Similarly, 86 per cent of the Democrats but only 71 per cent of the Republicans favored the requirement, and 84 per cent of persons 18 to 29 years of age while 78 per cent of those 30 to 49 and 79 per cent of those 40 and older favored the step.

The Gallup release stated that 58 per cent of those questioned said Congress should not be required "to obtain the approval of the people by means of a national vote" in order to declare war. Thirty five per cent thought Congress should be so required and 7 per cent had no opinion.

The results were based on a survey of 1,550 adults 18 and older interviewed in person at more than 300 locations in the nation, the polling organization said.

ONE CITIZEN VIEWS THE NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Col. F. X. Purcell, U.S. Air Force, retired, civil engineer and freelance writer, recently furnished me with a copy of a thought-provoking article he had written setting forth his views on the Nation's Capital.

As I believe his article would be of interest to many of our colleagues, I insert it in full at this point in the RECORD:

THE UNITED STATES NEEDS A CAPITAL
(By F. X. Purcell)

In spring we flock to Washington to see the cherry blossoms, the Lincoln Memorial, the White House and the Capitol. Most go home without noticing "the inner city", "the slum", the "crime capital of the world". Really, the ugly overshadows the beautiful. Beauty is there because the founding fathers planned it, but we need only ride up 14th Street to see the ugliness.

Why isn't our seat of government the showplace of the world?

George Washington, in 1791, commissioned Pierre Charles L'Enfant, major of engineers, son and pupil of a professor of fine arts, to lay out the capital. L'Enfant studied the plans of the great cities of Europe and worked on the principle, as he put it, "the plan should be drawn on such a scale as to leave room for that aggrandizement and em-

bellishment which the increase of the wealth of the Nation will permit it to pursue at any period however remote."

In 1825 L'Enfant died, broken and broke.

The L'Enfant plan has been called "the most complete as well as the most artistic city system ever carried out." The trouble is, it has not been well carried out. In early days this was because L'Enfant was pushed aside for political reasons; now it is because many people think its execution is legally or financially impossible. Not so!

The wise men who founded our country understood the need for an artistic, cultural capital and wrote the constitution accordingly. As for cost, the entire District of Columbia can now be bought for its taxes of thirty years.

The constitution (Section 8 of Article I) empowers Congress:

"To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States—for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings;"

Congress accordingly in 1790 established the present location of the District, and a year later the states of Maryland and Virginia ceded the necessary land. (Virginia's part was later turned back to the state.) A condition of this cession of land was that the United States would exercise exclusive jurisdiction forever. The United States then acquired legal title to most of the land that is now downtown Washington; but for lack of funds it had to hand half of it back to former private owners and to sell other tracts. This much is worth remembering: the citizens of the United States as a whole did own this land in 1791.

In the first half of the 19th Century the L'Enfant plan was followed in general with the resources available. But from 1850 to 1870 the population of Washington almost tripled, to 131,700. Then between 1871 and 1874 an experimental popular government ran up such a debt through overextension, graft and waste that the Federal Government had to step in and set up the present system.

As people from outside continued to flood the District, landowners built flimsy tenements which fell to ruin and became rats' nests. The massive Treasury Building and the ugly State, War and Navy Building were plumped down as if expressly to ruin the landscape. For half a century, "temporary" buildings have littered the Mall. Thus the slum was established and the national capital lost in the garbage.

So the first thing to do is to start to take back the land of the District of Columbia—every square inch of it—for the people of the United States. The second is to renew and extend the L'Enfant plan. Extension of the plan will require the same long-range vision as the original concept, to provide for the needs of the government "at any period however remote". All future construction must conform to the plan and to the purpose of the constitution.

This may sound like a grandiose and expensive program, but a moment's thought will show that it is not. We are not talking about buying New York City or Chicago or Los Angeles—their problems are their own. The District is only a little patch of Federal ground about seven miles by ten and much of the land is not built up. The assessed value of all private land is \$1,606,000,000, and since current land values are affected by interest and insurance rates, the government could probably get bargain prices. Improvements are assessed at \$2,066,000,000; not all need be purchased.

There will be delays caused by legal and political problems, requiring exercise of "eminent domain", to that the acquisition will be spread out over several years at, say, \$500,000,000 a year. At the same time the

U.S. can avoid buying land outside the District of Columbia for the needs of the capital.

Some landowners may object, but nobody can claim that he is robbed of his ancestral rights: the only communities that existed before the land was ceded to the Federal Government were the little settlement of Georgetown and, probably, the Indian village where Captain John Smith met Pocahontas. The 19 proprietors of the land originally taken over conveyed it to the president in trust, with the understanding that the parts not laid out for public use would be left in their hands. The present owners have only the right to reasonable payment for the land to be taken.

As the land is acquired, all unsafe, unsanitary and obsolete buildings will be razed and the areas converted to parks and lawns until needed for Government buildings. Thus the slum will gradually disappear and the capital will become a place of open air and green vistas.

It is not necessary or desirable to tear down all privately owned buildings. The capital will still be a center of culture with colleges, museums, churches and theaters. Visiting diplomats, tourists and people with government business will need hotels, restaurants, stores, garages and places of entertainment. Certain business establishments such as banks, and professional people like doctors and lawyers, will have their place. The land itself will be taken over and held in perpetuity by the government, but it may be rented out on long-term leases for "needful buildings" as provided by the constitution. Where a going concern is to stay in business, the initial rental can be made comparable to the current taxes. The government, by the terms of the lease, will always be able to terminate a lease if the land is misused or is needed for immediate construction.

When all this is under way—the slum wiped out and the intent of the constitution reaffirmed—the District will be able to breathe again and to resume its growth as the proudest capital in the world.

The Mall, expanded and beautiful, can be our Champs Elysee; the National Cathedral, our Notre Dame; Rock Creek Park, our Bois de Boulogne. We cannot have an Acropolis or a Roman Forum—yet—but thousands of years from now scholars and tourists may come to study the artistic glories of the Golden Age of America.

It takes no change in the constitution to accomplish all this. It takes, rather, an expression of the will of our 200 million people to carry out the intent of the constitution itself. That is what we elect our representatives in Congress for, and we should let them know that's what we expect.

A WORTHY CONSERVATION MOVE

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, conservation of fuel this winter could have a significant impact on the shortages made critical by the embargo of Mideast oil. To assist the nation in the current fuel crisis, many industries and private citizens are making valuable efforts to reduce use of energy.

Better insulation in homes and commercial buildings is one method for conserving heating fuel while at the same time providing consumers with lower heating bills. The Michigan Consolidated

Gas Co. which serves many of my constituents, is setting an example for utilities across the nation by actively promoting a home insulation program for its customers.

The program prompted the following favorable editorial comment from the Detroit News which I am inserting in the RECORD for the information of the members:

A WORTHY CONSERVATION MOVE

Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. has taken an imaginative step in energy conservation which proves that fuel economy is not the same as talking about the weather but doing nothing. The utility is aggressively promoting a home insulation program for its customers which could yield significant savings in gas supplies.

The program targets on 200,000 of firm's 840,000 residential customers whose homes are poorly insulated. Although current FHA standards require six inches of ceiling insulation, many older homes have little or no insulation.

The owner of a typical two-story uninsulated home built in Detroit before 1940 could cut his gas heating costs \$35 annually by following the utility's advice. Estimated cost of the insulating material, about \$90, would be recovered in three years.

But even owners of homes built within the past several years would benefit from improved insulation and that applies to homes heated by fuel oil—which is in critically short supply—or any other heat source.

The Michigan utility, which also serves Ann Arbor, Ypsilanti, Grand Rapids and much of northern Michigan, is believed the first in the nation to directly involve itself in such an energy conservation effort.

According to its estimates, if owners of the 200,000 most underinsulated houses take advantage of the program the fuel saving would be 6 billion cubic feet of gas, equivalent to the total gas heating consumption of 37,500 homes for an entire year.

There are reasons other than fuel and cost savings why homeowners should consider added insulation. A well-insulated home is more comfortable in winter and insulation has sound-deadening qualities. Ceiling or attic insulation also keeps a home cooler in summer.

The Michigan Public Service Commission, the state's utility regulator, gave quick approval to the gas company's fuel conservation program. Its advantages are so obvious that it raises the question of government insistence on proper insulation in all forms of housing.

For example, the FHA construction standard may not be followed where housing is built for conventional financing. Apartment structures and other multiple housing evidently follow other insulation rules and mobile construction varies widely.

In all its energy consumption the nation has two choices: to continue to waste irreplaceable energy supplies or to stretch as far as possible what is available. Michigan Consolidated's effort makes best use of gas for heating and should set an example for utilities and home builders across the nation.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues, the mail I received from back home immediately after the

firing of Archibald Cox was running heavily in favor of impeachment of President Nixon and not a small percentage of that mail suggested that he should resign immediately.

Following that initial surge of anti-Nixon sentiment, a good portion of which was orchestrated, my current mail has swung around completely and is now overwhelmingly in support of the President. In addition, I was back in the district last week and found that there is pretty broad sentiment in support of the President as expressed by people who were stopping me on the street and urging me to be sure and tell the President that they were for him and that he should not give up and should stay on the job.

We often hear these days the question, "How will it play in Peoria" and to answer that question I insert several letters from constituents residing in Peoria and other areas of my congressional district in the RECORD at this point:

PEORIA, ILL., November 15, 1973.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I rate myself as one of the millions often referred to as the silent majority. Well, I have remained silent too long! These are my sentiments:

1. I have complete confidence in the ability of President Nixon to effectively govern our nation. Recent National and Worldwide events substantiate this view.

2. I am against the impeachment of our President!

3. I am for a more accurate, fair, impartial, reporting of the news—especially by the TV media.

4. I have never witnessed so many persons branded as guilty on nationwide TV networks before all the evidence is in and in many cases before they have had a fair and impartial trial.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD B. PAGE.

PEORIA, ILL., November 13, 1973.

HON. BOB MICHEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: This letter is written to let you know this family is 100 percent behind President Nixon and his accomplishments since taking office.

In spite of all the (analysis ???) by the would be reporters of news, unemployment has gone down, crime has diminished, campus unrest has vanished, inflation has been held in check from what could have been a runaway fiasco. Greater strides have taken place to relieve international tensions than have been made in the last twenty five years. Our military forces have been pulled out of Viet Nam with thousands of our young mens lives saved.

Now about Watergate—not one person has been bodily hurt, not one person killed, and nothing was burgled from the so-called break in. The whole affair has been aired and televised to the point that from here on it hurts the nation to continue the hearings. Enough has come to light long ago to enable lawmakers to do the job that is needed to be done to prevent such a thing happening again. As far as justice is concerned, the culprits have suffered enough from the exposure they have had. To run them through the courts and met out jail sentences won't do them any good, nor the nation. It will only cost the taxpayers a lot of dollars.

The whole spectacle should be shut down.
Respectfully,

W. W. OWEN.

PEORIA, ILL., November 13, 1973.

MR. ROBERT MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I along with our many relatives and friends are really put out on the abusive treatment of our great President by many of our republican Senators and Congressman and the press and we are carefully watching the results of the meeting with the republicans Congressmen and Senators. Evidently they wanted him in 1968 and all good republicans wanted him and got him and we reelected him again in 1972. My first vote was for a republican and have been a good republican since 1928 and I say it is time for republicans to come to the aid of their party and not pussyfoot around the issues. Everyone knows the press wasn't for our President in 1964 and then he lost for Governor in California and the press said he was done for in politics and then in 1972 carried every State but one.

Well I think revenge is the real issue in the Watergate. I think the people are fed up with the (post mortem) held by the commentator after our President speaks on television.

I think when the press continually repeats over and over one thing then the people begin to feel the same way. Over and over the newsmen hurt us abroad and at home. But I have not given up and never have on Richard Nixon. I told Ivan Pettijohn when he told me Nixon was washed up after loss in California the he would be nominated in 1968 and was.

I don't think people really could forget so soon what he has done. Could these young people draft age and mothers forsake a party who has brought their sons back with peace, and an unemployment of only 4½ million.

But as I am out of the labor pool now I am free to get out and knock on doors as I am in good health, and us Senior Citizens will be heard from in the coming elections. Any way we hope you and Sen. Charles Percy do not follow same views as Brooks and the Senator from Colorado. But these are the feeling, of my family, relatives and friends that I have talked with. So you wonder some times just where they take these polls.

Yours sincerely,

HOWARD TAYLOR.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., November 17, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: As one of your constituents and supporters I would like to express my concern and opinion on the Nixon-Watergate Issue.

I personally feel that the President is telling the truth concerning the coverup, etc. I do not believe he should be impeached or resign. The President will be cleared, I believe and hope; but he can only return to strength if we will support him.

I ask you, as my representative, to help Mr. Nixon to regain his position and strength.

Your work is appreciated. As an officer of the government, you are in my prayers.

Sincerely,

B. JOEY WATT.

COLCHESTER, ILL., November 20, 1973.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHEL: I am writing to beg you to please give Mr. Nixon your support and trust in every way you can.

We are more convinced each day of his complete innocence and honesty in this Watergate mess! And we think this has gone on much, much, too long!

Let's now get back once more to the more important issues of peace, stability, and prosperity in the world!

A concerned housewife, mother, and farmer's wife.

MRS. RICHARD A. DIXON.

TOPEKA, ILL., November 15, 1973.

HON. ROBERT MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: We are up to our ears with Watergate! It is time we let our representatives in Congress know exactly where we stand, so here it is.

The fuss made over the Watergate matter is ridiculous. By no stretch of the imagination is it of such proportion to deserve so much attention, time and money. Is there any politician in Washington who could stand an investigation such as has been given Mr. Nixon? Could any politician since the Garden of Eden stand such? And when all is said and done, will the Congress do anything constructive to change the ways of politics? We seriously doubt it—we seriously doubt that it is humanly possible.

There is much talk of the excessive power of the executive branch of the government, but what really frightens us is the excessive and irresponsible power of the press. The brainwashing job done on the American people by the news media in the Watergate matter must surely be the envy of Communist countries everywhere. The whole coverage of the affair by the press seems to us to be a concerted effort to destroy Richard Nixon and nothing else.

As we see it, Richard Nixon was the people's choice for President of the United States, and unless Congress moves swiftly to confirm Gerald Ford as Vice President, the elimination of Mr. Agnew and the clamor for the impeachment or the resignation of President Nixon smacks of an attempt to overthrow a duly elected government.

We feel that in these times the job of President of the United States is of such magnitude that any president—Democrat or Republican—deserves the cooperation of the Congress and the country in carrying out his duties. This does not mean agreeing with everything he proposes or says, but it does rule out antagonism, persecution and acting like children who didn't get their way. The real problems of this country—inflation, energy, pollution, world peace, foreign relations, to name a few—are so varied and so great that quite frankly we do not see how Congress can afford the time they have spent on the Watergate matter.

We are a part of middle class America who pay the lion's share of the nation's taxes—not poor enough to be exempt from income tax and not rich enough to have a herd of lawyers to manipulate our way out of paying. We own our own farm and locally we pay, what seems to us, more than our fair share of local government costs through the real estate tax. We pay and pay and pay, and we resent having our money frittered away on such nonsense as Watergate, which is only one among many of the occasions when government spends the taxpayers' hard earned dollars with utter carefree abandon.

We live on a farm near Topeka, Illinois. We are endeavoring to see our four children through college. Three have received college degrees and the youngest is now a sophomore at ISU. It has not been particularly easy to do without and pinch pennies to raise and educate our family and pay our taxes—local, state and federal—only to see those taxes squandered on asinine projects dictated by irresponsible government. The greatest service the Congress could do for the American people would be to stop the excessive spending, spending, spending of the tax dollar on wasteful, unnecessary or half-baked appropriations.

In conclusion, we think Richard Nixon has

been an excellent president. He is being an excellent president under very trying circumstances. We voted for him in 1968, we voted for him in 1972 and we would vote for him again today. We sincerely wish that the Congress would take an honest look at the Watergate situation, get things in their right perspective and attend to the matters of government which are of real importance. As citizens of the state of Illinois we request you, our representative, to give reasonable cooperation to President Nixon in his efforts to solve the really pressing problems of our country.

Thank you for your attention.

Very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. DOYLE WALKER.

MACOMB, ILL., November 21, 1973.
Representative ROBERT MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In my opinion Watergate has gone much too far and those who have lead the attack on President Nixon have done the country a great disservice.

Also it seems to me that those who have not supported him in the crisis have failed to be good citizens. Each one of us owes allegiance to our President whether he be a Republican or a Democrat. President Nixon from the beginning has professed his innocence of any wrongdoing and we should accept that and believe him until it is proved otherwise. And it must be admitted that there is no actual proof of guilt—only suspicion and speculation—nothing that would stand up on impeachment or in a court of law.

I respectfully urge you and the Congress to leave the matter to the courts and support the President and get on with the business of the country.

Mrs. Harris joins me in these statements.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN L. HARRIS.

A "DUTY" LETTER

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, we all are aware of the wrenching effect the Watergate events have had on many, many loyal and concerned Americans.

I recently received a letter from a constituent, Mr. Tom Carson, of Cherry Hill, N.J., which rather graphically expresses the frustration of his family with these events.

I would like to share his letter with you. Therefore, without objection, I insert the text at this point in the RECORD: Re President Nixon and the United States Congress

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORSYTHE: This is a "duty" letter. I wish to be on record that I have believed for several months that President Nixon should resign. The events since last April when President Nixon finally deigned to address the public on television have been catastrophic and need not be enumerated here.

The public has been bewildered by the quantity, the rapidity of scandals within almost every area of the Executive branch of government. Adding to this is the apparent obfuscation of both houses of Congress.

Why would Congress pass 8 or is it now 9 bills and permit the President veto to stand? Is one man who obviously is doing every thing wrong a better evaluator of what effect

a bill will have on the public interest or well being than the Congress which presumably studied and researched the subject before obtaining a majority vote?

Frankly, I am ashamed of our Congress. The House of Representatives has no strong leadership and The Senate has leaders of dubious character or sensibilities. Why is Congress so mealy mouthed?

I have a 19 year old daughter with an above average IQ. She is in her second college year at Albright and she is so distraught she is planning to emigrate to Australia. Meanwhile she is paying a good deal of time reading about the asinine 16 year old Indian who claims to speak for God!

My daughter can't understand why an intelligent man like her father who was a prominent advertising director for 25 years, a man who gave 3 and a 1/2 years to service for his country, a man who is physically and mentally very capable, is unable to find work of any kind. She is also unable to understand why college graduates are forced into jobs as ribbon or cosmetics clerks when they have a degree in social science or other equally worthwhile subjects.

Our family viewpoint, and I believe we are typical of families with grown children (our other daughter is married), is that our Presidents since the Truman administration have let this country down. We feel Congressmen in both Houses have been inept. If we were of an age that would permit our entry, my wife and I would encourage our youngest daughter to go to Australia and we would go with her. We loved our Country, and we received our rewards as we contributed to its growth and well being. Today we see nothing left for us, and no future for our youngest daughter. Could you read this into the Congressional Record.

Sincerely, and best wishes,

TOM CARSON.

THE GAL FROM BOONE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Boone, Iowa, in my district is privileged to have Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower as one of its most beloved natives.

Our former First Lady travels annually to Boone to visit her uncle, Joel E. Carlson, and these trips are always welcomed by local relatives and friends.

In her most recent trip home, Mrs. Eisenhower consented to the following interview with Allison Engel which appeared in the November 24, 1973, issue of the Des Moines Register. I would like to take this opportunity to share it with my colleagues.

MAMIE WANTS TO BE THE "GAL FROM BOONE"
(By Allison Engel)

BOONE, IA.—"Ike was known by heads of state all over the world as the man from Abilene. I want to be known as the gal from Boone."

But Mamie Eisenhower, widow of one of the nation's most popular military figures and former President, cannot shun her role in history. She yearns for privacy and quiet, shuns the spotlight and seldom speaks out on current political controversies.

CURRENT TRIP

She prefers the simpler things. Example: She describes her current trip to her native Boone (to visit her uncle, Joel E. Carlson, 93) as one stop on a "journey of love."

Earlier, she had stopped in Abilene, Kan., for her annual visit to place a wreath on Ike's grave.

Consenting to a rare private interview earlier this week, a cheerful and composed Mamie talked on a potpourri of subjects:

Childhood trips to Iowa, life in the White House, her recipes for tomato pudding and a happy marriage, and the creation of her trademark, "Mamie bangs."

Although reluctant to answer questions on current political events and the continuing Watergate scandals, Mamie did express firm support for President Nixon.

"He's as honest as the day is long," she said. "If he weren't, he'd have a lot more money than he does now."

She added: "It's about time we all started thinking for ourselves—using that gray matter. An article . . . is just the opinion of one person."

"We ask too much of the President," she continued. "He wears too many hats. In other countries, there are prime ministers and so forth to do various things, but here we have one man do it all."

Most of her words on the presidency, however, were reserved for her White House life with Ike.

"I was Ike's wife. I took care of everything in the White House and he took care of the presidency. We were very happy," she said, her startling blue eyes showing a brief glimmer of tears.

They had the same arrangement at the Gettysburg farm, she said.

"The outside was Ike's and the house was mine. I'm the best porch sitter you ever saw," she said with the ready laugh that often punctuated her words.

Mamie said she never played golf with her husband, whose love for the game was legendary.

"There was no competition between us. What he did, I didn't do," she said.

"I don't know about the Kansas profanity he was supposed to use when he played, though. I heard he had a few choice words when the ball didn't go where he wanted it to, but I never heard them around the house," she said with a smile.

FLAG PIN

As she spoke the jeweled rad, white and blue flag pinned on her left shoulder blinked in the morning sun. Below that, the tiny diamonds that encircled a small gold Presidential Seal sparkled.

The seal was a past Christmas present from President Nixon, she said, and the flag pin was given to her in the Philippines in 1936. "It only has 48 stars," Mamie said. "I wear it with dinner clothes and everything . . . because Ike asked me to. He was a great patriot."

"I wear him, too," she said, fingering an Eisenhower silver dollar medallion that hung around her neck. "If he gets in the way, I just tuck him inside."

Her appearance belied her 77 years. The direct gaze, spontaneous smile and the inevitable bangs were the same that had graced the nation's newsprint for decades.

A question about those famous bangs prompted an amused reply.

Did they create quite a nationwide commotion?

"Certainly!" Mamie replied with a laugh. "But I've worn them all my life. One day, I just got out a scissors and said 'I'm going to cut bangs' and I clipped away," she said, gesturing with exaggerated cutting motions. "Oh, I clip them with nail scissors, any scissors," she added.

Mamie characterized her eight years in the White House simply as "busy times."

The busiest, she said, was "meeting lots of people. I'd go from a group of farm women to a group from arts and letters. I'd meet an average of 500 to 1,000 women every morning for the first two years in the White House," she stated proudly.

LOOKS AT EYES

When meeting people, she said, she looked at their eyes.

"I can tell more about a person by looking into his eyes. I can't tell you what color hat you are wearing, but I can remember your eyes. I notice teeth, too. Teeth and eyes."

"Everyone has her own way of managing the White House," Mamie said. "And the First Ladies have different color schemes and want to rearrange the furniture differently, but you can do pretty much as you please."

"I always had one rule, though: I didn't interfere with Uncle Sam," she stated with emphasis.

"I think that President and Mrs. Nixon are bringing dignity back to the White House—which I'm sure was there when Ike and I were there," she said.

Mamie said she has noticed two differences between her way of entertaining and her successors'.

"I liked high floral arrangement, and I see now where they're using smaller ones. I would always use carnations as a base flower," she added, explaining that she did so to avoid guests' possible allergies to other flowers.

Her fondness for carnations was well known. "The Colorado growers used to send me 300 a week for my own use," she said.

Mamie had no measure of any difference between Mr. Nixon as vice-president and now as President.

NO BUSINESS TALK

"I wouldn't know. The minute Ike walked into the mansion, business was dropped. I never knew—we never discussed the presidency," she said.

"It goes back to letting him run his business and me run the house. As you can see, I'm not a woman's libber," she confessed.

Mamie also confessed to not being a cook, but said she did remember a recipe for tomato pudding she submitted to a cookbook once.

"It's good. You ought to try it," she urged. Again, the quick peal of laughter. "It's not a dessert pudding. You serve it with beef or any roast meat. It's made with tomato paste, not whole tomatoes," she explained.

(It's also made with brown sugar, salt, bread cubes and butter, and baked in the oven.)

Mamie's life-style is such that cooking need not concern her.

She travels with 12 Secret Service agents and a secretary, who work to make Mamie's passage as smooth as possible.

When in Boone, the entourage stays at the Imperial Inn, a motel, where they are given a wing to themselves. Her visits are kept so quiet that some of the motel staff never see her during her stay.

"I live pretty much my own life now," Mamie said. "I go hither and yon, work on my projects and keep in touch with my family."

Some of her projects include working on a "People-to-People" program and close contact with Gettysburg (Pa.) College and Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls, N.Y.

A typical day, Mamie said, could have her waking up early.

"I always ring for breakfast at 8:15. My secretary comes at 9, and we go over letters and things until 4. So it's a very long day."

"There's one thing I still have—my checkbook and my signature," she said. "I answer most of the letters I receive, but don't write that down or I'll have everyone writing me," she instructed half-seriously.

Mamie said she "truly enjoys" her yearly visit to her birthplace. "I'm proud I'm from Iowa," she said. "I'll always know where the tall corn grows!"

Her uncle Joel, who celebrated his birth-

day with Mamie on Wednesday, "lives in the very house where he was born," Mamie said. "Can you imagine that?"

She recalled that she and her three sisters used to sleep on a mattress outside her uncle's home when they visited in the summer as small children.

"We thought that was hot stuff. We'd fall asleep at 9 p.m. thinking it was midnight," she said.

Another vivid memory was traveling from the Doud home in Denver to her grandmother's house in Boone.

BEES FOUND HER

"We had plumbing and indoor lights and everything and then we'd come to grandma's in Boone—with an outhouse out back," she said. "There were more bees around that place! And they'd find me," she giggled.

Mamie is "very much a family person," and pointed out that she now has three great-grandchildren.

"I think I'm a strange grandmother," she declared. "I don't baby-sit."

She said that she was "very pleased" about grandson David's decision to leave military service and study law. "David gave his time—three years—to Uncle Sam. He's not militarily-inclined at all."

SECRET SERVICE

She paused, and looked toward the two Secret Service agents in the room. "They're almost family too," she said. "Some of them have been with me for 20 years."

"They all know my shortcomings," Mamie said ruefully. "I have to be helped when I walk, you know."

But when she gave her final comment and issued her last warm smile, Mamie stood erect and walked carefully from the room slowly and proudly, without the aid of waiting hands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, November 27, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Teach me Thy way, O Lord, that I may walk in Thy truth; unite my heart to fear Thy name.—Psalms 86: 11.

O Thou who art good, whose love is everlasting, and whose truth endures through all the ages, open our eyes that we may see the way Thy spirit is beckoning us and open our ears that we hear the voice of Truth as she calls us to be truehearted, wholehearted, faithful, and loyal in this critical hour of our national life. Give to us the dauntless courage to so live our own lives and to so lead our people that we as a nation may be lifted above the bitterness that blights the brightness of brotherhood and be carried beyond the strife which separates the spirits of men.

Make us united in great purposes, elevated to genuine sympathies and eager for all good works. Keep us close to Thee this day that we may walk the way of truth and live the life of love for the sake of our country and the peace of the world: Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1106. An act to amend the Federal Reports Act to avoid undue delays in the collection of information by Government agencies.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1443, FURNISHING DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1443) to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organizations:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-664)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1443) to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organizations, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1973".

POLICY; DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In the chapter heading, immediately after "CHAPTER 1—POLICY", insert "DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATIONS".

(2) In section 102—

(A) insert "(a)" immediately after "STATEMENT OF POLICY.—"; and

(B) add at the end thereof the following:

"(b) The Congress further finds and declares that, with the help of United States economic assistance, progress has been made in creating a base for the economic progress of the less developed countries. At the same time, the conditions which shaped the United States foreign assistance program in the past have changed. While the United States must continue to seek increased cooperation and mutually beneficial relations with other nations, our relations with the less developed countries must be revised to reflect the new realities. In restructuring our relationships with these countries, the President should place appropriate emphasis on the following criteria:

"(1) Bilateral development aid should concentrate increasingly on sharing American technical expertise, farm commodities, and industrial goods to meet critical development problems, and less on large-scale cap-